

GL 324.254074
PRA 2ND CONF



104972
LBSNAA

इस्त्री प्रशासन अकादमी
Academy of Administration

मसूरी
ISSOORIE

पुस्तकालय
LIBRARY

104972

अवाप्ति संख्या

Accession No.....~~5715~~.....

वर्ग संख्या

Class No.....324.254074.....

पुस्तक संख्या

Book No.....*Pra*.....

2nd Conf.

R E P O R T

of the

SECOND NATIONAL CONFERENCE

of the

PRAJA SOCIALIST PARTY

HELD AT GAYA (BIHAR)

December 26—30, 1955

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I MESSAGES	1
II PROCEEDINGS :	
<i>December 26, 1955</i>	
Open Session	9
<i>December 27, 1955</i>	
Discussion on General Secretary's Report ...	12
Speech of Jayaprakash Narayan ...	25
Resolution on Political Situation ...	32
Resolution on Economic Situation ...	36
<i>December 28, 1955</i>	
Discussion on Kamath Committee Report ...	37
Discussion on Policy Statement ...	42
<i>December 29, 1955</i>	
Resolution on Goa	64
Discussion on Policy Statement ...	66
<i>December 30, 1955</i>	
Amendments to Party Constitution ...	75
Amendments to Policy Statement ...	88
Resolution on International Situation ...	96
Resolution on Kisan	99
Resolution on Labour	99
Election of New Executive	103
III APPENDICES	
(A) Chairman's Address	111
(B) General Secretary's Report ...	120
(C) Resolutions	136
(D) Report of the Kamath Committee ...	149
(E) Constitution & Rules	153
(F) Policy Statement	167
(G) List of Delegates Attending ...	233
(H) Statement of Accounts	239

REPORTED and COMPILED by

SOMPRAKASH SHAIKA

PREM BHASIN

R. P. PARASURAM

Printed by the Delhi Press, New Delhi, and Published by Y. B. R. Murthy
for the Praja Socialist Party, 18 Windsor Place, New Delhi.



ACHARYA NARENDRA DEVA

Born : October 31, 1889

Died : February 19, 1956

MESSAGES

**U Ba Swe, Chairman, Asian Socialist Conference,
Rangoon:**

On behalf of the Asian Socialist Conference I would like to convey to all of you our fraternal greetings on this very important occasion of the Annual Conference of the Praja Socialist Party. You all have gathered to discuss very urgent and important matters concerning the Party and its role for the future of socialist society in India.

You all are aware of the fact that the role of the Praja Socialist Party for the emancipation of the masses is not limited to India alone, but it has a tremendous role to play in the development of socialist movement in Asia and the world. Indeed it is the vanguard of progressive forces in India and as one of the sponsors of the Asian Socialist Conference, its contribution for the advancement and emancipation of the downtrodden masses in Asia and Africa cannot be minimised and overlooked.

Ever since the independence of our respective countries, our close co-operation and our sincere efforts to achieve international peace is a historic contribution. We have achieved in setting up democratic forces and at the same time we have championed the cause of colonial freedom and emancipation of the workers and peasants in Asia and Africa.

With the establishment of the Asian Socialist Conference for the period of a little over two years, we have been co-operating very closely with the Socialist Parties in Asia and Africa and our relations with the Socialist International, IUSY and Socialist Alliance of Workers in Yugoslavia have been very much strengthened. From our very first Conference in Rangoon we have adopted common programmes, and we have agreed upon the basic principles of socialism. Our resolutions on economic development, agrarian problems, international peace and security along with the freedom of colonies have served as guiding principles for the Socialist Parties and freedom movements.

We have been successful in setting up an Economic Planning and Information Bureau to study close co-operation in the economic development of Asia while the Anti-Colonial Bureau has been busy with its own programmes and publications. It has adopted a Declaration on Colonialism and succeeded in observing Dependent Peoples Freedom Day every year on 30th October since last year with the co-operation of the Socialist International, IUSY,

Movement for Colonial Freedom and other nationalist movements all over the world.

I am sure you all will join with us to rejoice over these initial successes of our young organisation during the last three years. At the same time, we share your worries and anxieties over the split of the Party in India and the temporary setback in the work and programme of the Party. Differences of approach and opinion regarding ideology, strategy and tactics are bound to occur in any socialist movement during its struggle for socialism. We are quite confident that you will find the best remedy to overcome these difficulties successfully. We also take comfort in the thought that whatever organisational, tactical or ideological difficulties you may experience temporarily will provide a beneficial lesson not only to you but also to us in our relentless and determined struggle for the achievement of socialism.

Apart from this sad event, there are heartening and welcoming achievements too. In Japan, the two parties have successfully merged and a united and strong Socialist Party has emerged. It is a great encouragement not only to the working class in Japan but also to our movement in Asia.

I now would ask you to accept the heartiest greetings of the Asian Socialist Conference and wish you every success.

Long live socialism and down with reactionary forces.

Mr. Morgan Phillips, Chairman and Mr. Julius Braunthal, Secretary, The Socialist International, London:

We wish to extend, on behalf of the Socialist International, our most cordial greetings to the Second National Conference of the Praja Socialist Party, assembled at Gaya on 26th December.

The Socialist International watched with sympathy and great admiration the rise of the Indian socialist movement. It was deeply impressed by the idealism which inspired its rank and file as well as its leaders in their crusade for our cause. It regarded the outcome of the first general elections in India in which the Party, after only four years of existence, polled more than eleven million votes — although disappointing for many of our Indian comrades—as an astonishing success. It welcomed the broadening of the social basis of the socialist movement by the merger of the Socialist Party with the K. M. P. P., which added more than six million votes to the strength of the Praja Socialist Party. It considered the “Governmental Programme of Socialist India”, adopted at its first National Conference, one of the finest documents in the literature of international socialism. The achievements of the Party during the brief span of time since its inception in 1948 entitles it to respect.

We profoundly regret that this promising development has been retarded by an acrimonious controversy which ultimately led to a fateful split in the Party.

As far as we have been able to observe from the publications and pronouncements of the dissenting groups and their leaders, no

issues of principle or even of tactics are involved in the split; both the majority and the minority of the Party have professed that they stand for the decision on tactics, adopted by the Betul Convention in July 1953, and for the principles embodied in the Party's programme, adopted by the National Conference at Allahabad in December 1953.

We wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to our comrade Acharya Narendra Deva, one of the most prominent founders of the Indian Socialist Party. For many years he suffered imprisonment for the ideals to which he is devoted and regardless of his ill health, he accepted the strenuous office of Chairman at the Nagpur Conference in 1954, in order to resolve the controversy in the Party.

Yet although Narendra Deva enjoyed the respect and confidence of all sections of the Party and was elected by a unanimous vote, he failed—through no fault of his own or of the Executive Committee—to prevent the disruption of the Party.

We sincerely hope that the harm done to the international socialist movement by this split will soon be made good and that the leaders and the rank and file in both camps, aware of their great responsibility for the destiny of socialism, will endeavour to restore the unity of Indian socialism.

In this sense we beg you to accept our very best wishes for the success of the Conference.

Mr. Nath Pai, President, International Union of Socialist Youth, Vienna:

We were delighted to receive your invitation to attend the Second Annual Conference of the PSP. We should have indeed been very happy to send a representative to your Conference. The distance and time involved, however, make this impossible.

The IUSY, representing the socialist youth of the whole world, extends its warmest greetings to the delegates assembled at Gaya. We are aware of the historic significance of your Conference. We feel confident that your Conference will take decisions which will master the difficulties which beset socialism today and lay the foundation of its victory tomorrow. Socialism alone offers the path of peace and freedom, equality and prosperity to a world torn by totalitarian communism and unbridled capitalism. In achieving these aims and redeeming the hopes of millions of men and women all over the world the Socialists of India have a great contribution to make. The emergence of a Socialist India will hasten the dawn of universal socialism. We send you our best wishes for the success of your Conference.

Prof. Pulin De, Secretary, Pakistan Socialist Party :

It is true that your Conference is meeting at a significant moment under the Chairmanship of the most eminent among us all and the decisions you take will not only govern the future pace

and direction of the Socialist Movement in India but will also act as a beacon light towards the consolidation of the Socialist forces in Asia. And we very much hope that the breaches inside the rank and file of the Socialist forces in India will be healed so that the vacuum left by the Party now in power can be gainfully filled by one unified Socialist Front in your country.

Fraternal greetings to the comrades who will be meeting in the Conference and good wishes for the success of the Conference.

Mr. Mosaburo Suzuki, Chairman, Social Democratic Party of Japan:

We, Japanese Socialists, recently reunified by your strong support and help, firmly believe that your party will continue to play an important role in Asia. Further, we hope and expect that your Party, being a fortress of Asian Socialism, will fight for the realisation of our common goal, socialism and democracy.

We earnestly wish the success of the National Conference and hope this Convention will become the turning point for the glorious advance of the Praja Socialist Party.

Socialist Party, Indonesia:

Sincerely hope the Conference and its deliberations will strengthen socialist forces in India and Asia.

Mr. Tan Phock Kin, General Secretary, Labour Party of Malaya :

We are instructing Com. K. R. R. Choudhary, Chairman of the Perak Division of the Party and a member of the National Executive Council, who is on his way to Madras, to attend your Conference as our representative.

Wishing your Conference every success.

Socialist Party, Austria:

Not able to send representative to your Conference because of our parliamentary activities. Wish your Conference great success.

Mr. H. C. Hansen, Chairman, Social Democratic Party of Denmark:

We feel that the present time is a very important period for our Indian comrades in their endeavours to build up the new India, and we send you our best wishes and warmest hopes that your Conference will be of real value to your Party in future days.

Mr. Guy Mollet, Secretary General, Parti Socialiste, France:

You certainly know that we traditionally follow with warm sympathy the efforts of Asian Socialism, therefore we hope that present difficulties within the Indian Movement will not affect the development of Socialism in your country. Hope these difficulties will be soon overcome.

Mr. Matteo Matteotti, Secretary, Social Democratic Party of Italy:

We send our best wishes and most sincere fraternal greetings to our comrades of the Praja Socialist Party and express our hopes that the Conference will be of great value for further progress of democratic socialism in India.

Mrs. Marija Vilfan, Secretary, Commission for International Relations, The Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia:

We wish your Conference all success.

Secretary, MAPAI (Socialist Party of Israel) :

Israel Socialists send warm fraternal greetings. Wishes for successful deliberations. Reiterate our faith in future of Indian Socialist Movement which has great historic mission in India and must play leading role in Asian Socialist Conference. Whilst regretting existing differences hope Conference will succeed in reforgeing unity to enable Indian Socialists play their full part in India and Asia.

Lorne Ingle, National Secretary, Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, Canada:

Although we are separated by a great distance, I can assure you on behalf of our national executive and council that there is a very strong bond of sympathy between the CCF in Canada and our comrades in the Praja Socialist Party in India. We wish to express at this time our solidarity with your comrades in the magnificent fight you are conducting in your country. We hope that your conference will be successful in every respect and that it will carry your movement forward on the road to socialist victory in India.

Mr. Emanuel Nowogrudsky and Dr. Emanuel Scherer, Secretaries, International Jewish Labour Bund, New York:

The most important goals for socialists are world peace, liberty and freedom, international brotherhood of nations, equality, justice and an economy of plenty. We condemn totalitarian methods and we stand for political as well as economic democracy.

As Jewish socialists who are waging for over half a century a

constant struggle against Jewish nationalistic trends, who are convinced that the universal victory of socialism is the only way to redeem mankind, we salute you as brothers in arms.

Mr. Norman Thomas, Union For Democratic Socialism, New York:

I am deeply honoured to be asked to the Second National Conference of the Praja Socialist Party to be held from December 26th.

I regret I shall not be able to be with you and I send you my greetings and all good wishes.

Mr. S. O. Veitch, Deputy Secretary, The People's National Party, Jamaica:

We desire to take this opportunity of extending fraternal greetings to the Conference with the sincere prayer that your deliberations will be so guided and governed that they will result in the good of your country and the success of the Party.

Mr. Fenner Brockway, M. P., London :

Please extend my warmest greetings of solidarity to the delegates. The triumph of Democratic Socialism in India is now more important than ever. India will determine the future social pattern of a large part of the continent of Asia and may be decisive in the issue of war and peace for the world. I hope the Conference will lead to conclusions which will greatly strengthen the socialist movement.

PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY—DECEMBER 26, 1955

EVENING—OPEN SESSION

The Second National Conference of the Praja Socialist Party commenced at 3 p. m. on December, 26, 1955 at Gandhi Maidan, Gaya (Bihar) to the tune of Party songs. About 50,000 spectators, 600 delegates and 900 member visitors attended.

WELCOME ADDRESS

Mahamaya Prasad Sinha, Chairman, Praja Socialist Party (Bihar), welcoming the delegates and member visitors said: This Conference is being held at a time when extensive parts of this State are suffering from nature's curses like floods and draught on the one hand, and the repressive policy of the government on the other. Even after eight years of uninterrupted Congress rule in India the country remains steeped in poverty. The need of the hour is a correct diagnosis of the present malaise besetting the country and a bold step to eradicate it. The Praja Socialist Party is eminently fit to perform both these tasks. We are glad you are meeting in this historic town of Gaya and I sincerely welcome you on behalf of the people and the State Branch of the Party.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Triloki Singh proposed K. R. Karanth to the Chair. He said: Till the last minute we had hoped that the Chairman, Acharya Narendra Deva, would be in our midst and preside over the Conference. But his physicians did not permit the journey on considerations of his health, thus depriving us of his inspiring presence and mature guidance. But we are fortunate to have in our midst K. R. Karanth, Chairman of the South Kanara Branch of the Party and a stalwart of the freedom fight. He is not only an eminent lawyer but a consistent champion of the underdog and the downtrodden. You all know him well and I need not introduce him to you. He has been one of the most eminent members of the National Executive ever since the inception of the Party. With your permission I propose him to the Chair.

Seconding Triloki Singh's proposal, Mahamaya Prasad Sinha paid glowing tributes to K. R. Karanth's patriotism and socialist zeal and expressed the confidence that with his mellow wisdom and administrative experience he would guide the deliberations of the Conference to a fruitful conclusion.

K. R. Karanth was than voted to the Chair amidst thunderous applause and shouts of *Praja Socialist Party Zindabad*.

Thanking the delegates he said: I am deeply grateful to you for the honour you have done me. To deputise for Acharya Narendra Deva is a privilege.

Swaraj has come but *Ram Rajya* has yet to be achieved. In European countries, particularly in the United Kingdom, the socialist governments have done wonderful work for the betterment of the lot of the common man. The Congress Government in India, on the other hand, has failed to deliver the goods. I appeal to the youth of the country to band themselves together and to work for the social transformation of our ancient community.

MESSAGES

Y. Sinai, Representative of Mapai (Israel): In a brief message to the Conference, Y. Sinai conveyed the goodwill and best wishes of the people and the labour movement of Israel. He said: I am happy to be here in the midst of fellow socialists struggling for the emancipation of toiling humanity from the bondage of poverty, inequality and exploitation. We, of the labour movement in Israel, share your hopes, your aspirations and many of your problems. We are parts of the world-wide brotherhood of democratic socialism and wish our Indian comrades best success.

National liberation remains an empty shell unless it is accompanied by basic changes in the economic and social structure of the community. We have been grappling with this problem ever since the foundation of our State and the Socialists of Israel are always prepared to share their experience and whatever they have with their brethren in India.

The biggest task before the International Socialist Movement today is to bridge the gulf between the rich and the poor countries of the world. In this task, as well as in the preservation of peace, the Socialists of Israel would be ever willing to make their humble contribution.

Prem Bhasin then read out the messages received from Socialist Parties abroad.

Triloki Singh then read out Acharya Narendra Deva's Presidential Address (See Appendix A).

The Chairman then called upon Acharya Kripalani to address the open session of the Conference.

Acharya J. B. Kripalani: *Swaraj* would be destroyed if the poverty and ignorance of the teeming millions of India are not banished. If we cannot solve this problem we should think Mahatma Gandhi lived in vain and died in vain and that his

blood is on us.

The Praja Socialist Party has failed so far in this direction. If it is unable to meet this challenge in future there would be no use for it. A solution of these problems should be the aim of the Party. The way to solve this problem is to follow the economic and social programme evolved by Gandhiji. It cannot be solved merely by criticising the Government.

Referring to the Five Year Plan, Acharya Kripalani said: Even Shri Deshmukh, the Union Finance Minister, has admitted that unemployment figures have gone up by five millions during the Plan period. The Ambar Charkha (hand spinning wheel) has a capacity four times higher than that of the ordinary spinning wheel. It could be a great help in fighting unemployment. And yet the Government has not made up its mind whether it should be introduced or not. All this is being done in the name of Mahatma Gandhi and by those who claim to be his followers and heirs. God save us from such followers.

Mahatma Gandhi's one interest was the interest of the masses. All other interests yielded place to it. Everything depends on the co-operation of the masses. Everything must therefore be measured in terms of the masses. Even all the temples in the country would have to be closed down if the common man keeps aloof from them. The interests of the masses should never be ignored.

Turning to controversies over the readjustment of State boundaries, he said: Politicians and educated men are responsible for it. Both Bengal and Bihar seem to have forgotten that they form part and parcel of India. The masses do not know any problem other than that of poverty, misery and ignorance. Poor people who die of hunger are not bothered whether they die in Bengal or Bihar.

It is futile to argue whether Hindi or Bengali are derived from Sanskrit. These controversies do not touch the ignorant masses. During my recent tour of Chhotanagpur I found on enquiry that many people there did not even know that the Britishers had left India. Is it not strange that in independent India universal ignorance and universal suffrage go together?

CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION

The Chairman then moved the Condolence Resolution. (See Appendix C).

He said: I request you to stand up and observe complete silence for a minute as a mark of respect for the departed patriots and colleagues of ours.

The whole audience stood up and remained in pin drop silence for one minute.

The open session then concluded with the singing of the National Anthem.

TUESDAY—DECEMBER 27, 1955

MORNING—DELEGATES SESSION

The Delegates Session commenced at the Delegates Camp at Tilla Dharmashala, Gaya, at 9 a. m. on December 27, 1955. K. R. Karanth was in the Chair.

CONFERENCE PROGRAMME

M. R. Dandavate placed before the assembled delegates and member visitors the programme for the four-day Delegates Session prepared by the National Executive. The House approved of the programme:

Tuesday, December 27, 1955

9—12 noon	Discussion on General Secretary's Report
3—4 p. m.	Address by Jayaprakash Narayan
4—6 p. m.	Resolutions on Political Situation and Economic Situation

Wednesday, December 28, 1955

9 to 10.30 a. m.	Discussion on Kamath Committee Report
10.30 to 12 noon	Discussion on Policy Statement
3—6 p. m.	Discussion on Policy Statement

Thursday, December 29, 1955

9—10.30 a. m.	Resolution on Goa
10.30 to 12 noon	Discussion on Policy Statement
3—6 p. m.	Amendments to Policy Statement

Friday, December 30, 1955

9—11 a. m.	Amendments to the Party Constitution
11—12 noon	Resolution on International Situation
3—5 p. m.	Resolutions on Kisan and Labour
5—7 p. m.	Election of the New Executive

GENERAL SECRETARY'S REPORT

The General Secretary read out his Report (See Appendix B).

The Chairman invited the delegates to discuss the Report. Deven Sen (West Bengal) initiated the discussion.

Deven Sen (West Bengal): There is not much to be criticised in this Report. But even then there are certain points which deserve attention.

It is gratifying to note the increase in the balance from Rs. 502 to Rs. 20,000. What the Report however fails to show is what is this due to. Is it due to greater income or less expenditure? It is good for the Party to have some reserves. But

will it not have been more beneficial if the money had been spent on furthering Party activities and building up its strength?

The Report gives figures of membership but does not give any analysis. Why has there been a decrease in membership from West Bengal? Different provinces show either a rise or a decline in their membership figures. The Report should have contained an analysis of the reasons underlying the same.

There are other important omissions as well. The PSP came into being as a result of the merger of three distinct political Parties : the Socialist Party, the Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party and the Forward Bloc. But does the new Party have the combined strength and resources of the three parties? No. The National Executive and the General Secretary have to explain this. I would, however, like to emphasise the need for a clear-cut and definite programme capable of rousing the enthusiasm of Party workers and eliciting confidence of the people.

Mahamaya Prasad Sinha (Bihar) interrupted him and asked : Why don't you explain your attitude to the INTUC ?

Deven Sen : I will do it when the Party's Labour policy is taken up for discussion.

Continuing, he said : The Report contains no reference to the refugees. The refugee problem is getting acute day by day. A ceaseless flow of refugees continues to come into West Bengal, leading to unrest and agitation. The West Bengal Branch of the Party may not have sent any report to the Central Office on this problem and the steps that they have taken to meet the situation. But it should be possible even at this stage to supplement the Report. I hope it will be done. Many Party workers in the province have courted imprisonment while espousing the cause of the refugees.

There is no reference to the squad of volunteers sent by West Bengal Branch to participate in the Goa non-violent liberation campaign. We have not lagged behind in this heroic struggle. I hope the General Secretary will correct this omission.

K. Kenchappa (Mysore) : Refer to the first page of the Report. I do not understand how the National Executive ceased to exist as a sequel to the resignation of the Chairman, Acharya Kripalani, at Nagpur. Under the constitution the National Executive has the power to fill up any vacancy. Was it the case of the entire Executive having resigned ? If so, it should have been clearly stated.

Page 2 mentions the number of meetings the National Executive held during the outgoing year. The Executive met only six times. In my opinion, the Executive should have devoted more time and met more often to deliberate on the serious issues confronting the Party during this crucial year. Again, is it not surprising that only one of these six meetings should

have been held in South India? Such a treatment on the part of the National Executive cannot be appreciated by those who work in the South. The South surely deserves much greater care and attention from the National Executive. It will prove beneficial to the whole Party. I therefore hope that more meetings will be held in the South in the future.

Andhra was given permission to submit its membership returns after the expiry of the last date fixed by the National Executive for this purpose. Is this not discrimination? Why should all provinces be not treated alike? I do not object to it. But there should be a regular provision in the constitution for this.

The total number of membership is also not very encouraging and cannot speak well of the activities of the Party.

I would like to make another suggestion. The Party should be organised on the basis of five zones. It will go a long way in toning up Party organisation and increasing its strength.

G. C. Kondaiah (Andhra): I would like to draw attention to certain lapses in the Report. Important developments have taken place in the international sphere during the outgoing year but the Report makes no reference to them. Internally, Dr. Lohia and a few of his friends are no more in the Party. They accused the Party of smothering internal democracy. The Report should have effectively met this charge. The Allahabad Conference adopted a Policy Statement and a number of resolutions. The Report should have shown how far and in what manner they were implemented. Again, what has been the relationship between the Centre and the Provincial Branches. How far did they help each other during the year? What is the relationship between the Party and other mass organisations run under its auspices: the Hind Mazdoor Sabha, the Hind Kisan Panchayat and the Samajwadi Yuvak Sabha? Does the Party run them? The Report throws no light on these various points without which a correct assessment of the Party's activities and functioning during the year is not possible. I hope the supplementary report of the General Secretary will take care of these points.

Nagendra Nath Singh (Uttar Pradesh): Many items have been left out. There is no reference to floods and the activities of the Party in this regard although Party workers have been in the forefront of flood relief work. I appreciate the reference to the Samajwadi Yuvak Sabha in the Report, but the reference leaves much to be desired. No mention has been made of our attitude to, and work in, the students organisations. I feel that the Party is not attracting the students and youth to its fold. We can only neglect them at our peril. We have to devise ways and means of attracting them to the only genuine party of socialism in our land.

A little discrepancy seems to have crept into the Report.

While Uttar Pradesh has more members than Bihar, the latter seem to have been allotted more delegates than the former.

Allow me to draw attention to a serious shortcoming in our work. I refer to Party literature. Practically nothing has been achieved in this field during the year. But can we hope to build up a real and vigorous socialist movement in the country without bringing out socialist literature?

Sanat Kumar Mehta (Gujarat): Party organisation was divided into three regions after the Nagpur Convention. But there is no reference to the working of this regional scheme in the Report. I am afraid nothing much came out of it.

There has been a split in the Party. We should have been told precisely how many have deserted the Party. We should have been given their names also. The Report should also clearly state who and how many joined the Congress and who and how many have joined Lohia's new party.

The names of Party members in State Legislatures and Union Parliament should also have been incorporated in the Report so that Party workers in the far-flung areas of the country can know to whom they should send their suggestions and grievances.

There is a regular Party Branch in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. But we do not know how it is functioning. We should have liked to know what its relationship with the Plebiscite Front is.

The Gujarat Branch has been in the forefront of the Goa liberation campaign. Ishwarbhai led a batch of more than a thousand peaceful volunteers. He is still languishing in a Portuguese prison cell. All this deserved a little more attention from the General Secretary.

Two other things. The Gujarat Branch has held its regular annual provincial conference. And the fortnightly *Chetana* may also be included in the list of Party journals.

Chandu Medekar (Maharashtra): I object to the sentence on page 8 of the Report, saying that the PSP Ministry in Travancore-Cochin during the few months of its existence acquitted itself fairly well. It did not. On the other hand, it lowered the prestige of the Party and lost the confidence of the people by resorting to police firing and oppression on trade union workers.

In regard to the split in the Party I am of the considered opinion that it could have been avoided. If the National Executive had acted with promptness and instituted a proper enquiry into the whole episode leading to Madhu Limaye's suspension by the Bombay Executive, I still feel the story would have been different.

The General Secretary has appealed to Party workers to rise to the occasion and be an effective instrument for the fulfilment of the urges and aspirations of the people. In my humble opinion the appeal could have been addressed to Party leaders with

greater benefit. Party workers have stood by the Party and have been putting in their best efforts for the Party. If the leaders had lived up to the expectations we would have had a healthier and a stronger Party.

Sohan Lal Gupta (Madhya Pradesh) : There is nothing in the Report from which we can prepare a comparative analysis of Party strength during the last few years. There has been a fall in membership. But we have not been enlightened on the causes underlying this fall.

I am rather constrained to point out that the National Executive has failed to implement its resolutions on Goa. The Party, it is true, sent innumerable batches of volunteers to participate in the campaign. The Party's prestige was enhanced thereby. But the decisions were not implemented in full. A more determined and vigorous policy would have carried the whole country with it. It is not enough to issue instructions to Party branches. The National Executive's resolution on falling agricultural prices met the same fate. It remained a paper resolution and no Party branch actively mobilised public opinion in support of the policy of *price support* advocated by the Executive.

I have a word to say about meetings of the National Executive. In the first place, the Executive should meet more often. And secondly, the meetings should be held at places which members find convenient to reach. Because these factors are not given the weight they deserve, the meetings of the National Executive are often poorly attended. I am told that on a few occasions the meetings had not even a quorum.

It is very urgent that members of the National Executive should not speak with different voices on day-to-day problems facing the country and the Party. It leads to confusion among the public and Party ranks. Party would be much stronger and a better-knit organisation if there was some uniformity in the public pronouncements of our leaders.

Shanti Patel (Bombay) : The General Secretary's Report should contain a review of the important incidents and events of the closing year. But we don't find any reference to the agitation carried on in Bombay in connection with SRC Proposals. I do not propose to speak on this issue but merely draw your attention to the fact that there was division in Party ranks in Bombay on this question. Was the agitation launched by the Party on right lines? I do not think so. A united front with the Communists was forged and a united committee formed with them without the knowledge or approval of the Bombay Executive. The agitation took an ugly shape culminating in murder, loot and arson. The PSP leaders did their best to control it. But how could they when the Communists were bent upon creating trouble? I don't think the National Executive approved of it. Such incidents and methods do not add to the

strength of the Party. Rather, they lower its prestige. The Report should have thrown light on all these issues.

J. K. Joshi (Vindhya Pradesh): It is surprising that one person, Bipin Pal Das, should have been asked to look after the Party organisation in two regions—Eastern and Central. The result was that many areas were neglected. Two persons should have been appointed to look after these two regions.

Much time and space has been wasted on Travancore-Cochin but nothing has been said about Vindhya Pradesh. Vindhya, I am afraid, is being neglected by the Party as much as by the Congress under Nehru.

I would like to know what definite steps have been taken by the Party in regard to persons who suffered in the course of the Goa liberation movement. What has the Party done to secure the release of those arrested and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment in Goa. Stalwarts like N. G. Goray, Ishwarlal Desai and Shiru Limaye continue to rot there under inhuman conditions. Mere talk would not suffice. Some definite and concrete steps should be taken.

I also suggest that the balance sheet should in future be prepared while submitting the Annual Report.

Karpoori Thakur (Bihar): It has been our practice that the General Secretary submits a detailed and comprehensive Report to the National Conference. We are meeting after two years and yet we have such a brief document before us. I think the General Secretary's Report should not only contain a review of Party activities in the closing year but also throw some light on the tasks ahead. I am sorry that the Report does not mention the satyagraha campaign in Shahabad District in Bihar against the enhancement of irrigation rates. More than 700 comrades were arrested during the course of it.

The PSP has 25 members in the Bihar Legislative Assembly and not 24 as mentioned in the Report. The Report again makes no reference to PSP members in various State Legislative Councils in the country.

The Report throws very little light on the actual functioning of the Party and its organisational efficiency. There is, for instance, the question of provincial branches sending regular reports to the Central Office. What is the exact position in regard to this? How many provinces send their reports regularly?

The Report has failed to mention Shri Rameshwar Maharaj, Sadhu of Samastipur, who took part in the Goa Liberation Movement and was shot dead. It is true that he was not a member of the Party at that time. But he remained a Party member upto 1952 and always had intimate contacts with the Party. His name should have been incorporated in the Report.

Party workers have initiated struggles against encroachments on civil liberties in Bihar. Hundreds of workers have been prosecuted. Many workers have suffered imprisonment. But the Report

makes no reference to them.

I hope the General Secretary would cover all these points in his finalised Report.

Harbhajan Singh (Punjab): I have to draw the General Secretary's attention to two parliamentary by-elections in Uttar Pradesh, particularly to the Kanpur by-election. It was widely reported in the press that the Party entered into a united front with the Communists in these by-elections. Joint meetings with both the flags—the Communist flag rather more prominently displayed—were regularly held. What action did the National Executive take in this regard? Was it in accord with the Allahabad Policy Statement? The same story was reported in the course of the Kanpur textile strike. What has been done to put a stop to such happenings in the future.

The Report gives no clear guidance in regard to our attitude to the Hind Kisan Panchayat. A part of the Hind Kisan Panchayat is under Lohia's control. How do we meet the situation? Do we also continue to function under the same name or do we think in terms of launching a new organisation? Apart from this, the Party still lacks a precise and clear agricultural policy. The Planning Commission have instituted various sub-committees to study the question of agrarian and land reforms. I am sorry to say that the Party has not submitted any memoranda to these committees. The Punjab Branch of the Party has submitted a memorandum, but was it not the job of the National Executive to apply its mind to the problem and prepare a scheme?

On the question of discipline I want to bring into your notice a flagrant breach. On the eve of the publication of the SRC Report the Central Office sent instructions to all Party branches not to issue any public statement on the recommendations before the National Executive met and deliberated on the issues raised. But certain prominent members, some of them even members of the National Executive, rushed to the press without waiting for the National Executive to meet. Such members, in my opinion, should have been brought to book without any hesitation. If such flagrant breaches of discipline are allowed to go unchallenged, the Party might have to knock its head against another thorny problem sooner rather than later.

The Report, not unduly, praises the achievements of the short-lived minority government in Travancore-Cochin. But the Party did nothing to publicise these achievements when the government was in power, in spite of the fact that hostile and false propaganda was being carried on against it in the press.

Biswanath Pandit (Utkal): Party accounts show a payment of Rs. 2000/- to the Asian Socialist Conference, but there is no reference in the report to our work in the ASC Bureau where the Party has its representative.

The General Secretary should have given us an analytical report of the Bhoodan movement and its effect on the Party.

Many important and active Party members, including Jayaprakash Narayan, are devoting their major time to this movement. The delegates would have been interested to know the result of the impact of the movement on the Party.

The Report does not say anything about the students. We have to exert our utmost to attract them to the cause of socialism. What would be our relation with the SYS? How do we reorganise the movement on a sure and sound foundation? The Report gives no lead on this point.

The Hind Mazdoor Sabha and the Hind Kisan Panchayat present thorny organisational problems. Both Lohia's new party and the PSP are working in these organisations. How do we straighten this out? The Hind Mazdoor Sabha has another problem. Party members continue to work not only in rival trade unions but also in different central labour organisations. Deven Sen of the West Bengal Party, for instance, continues to be an office-bearer of the Indian National Trade Union Congress in Bengal.

The financial position of the Party is very unsound. But something could be done to improve it if we properly tap our representatives in the legislatures. We have tried this in Utkal and found it helpful and workable. Party members in the Union and the State Legislatures pay the whole of their salaries and allowances to the Party and receive from the Party the usual allowances for full-time workers. I have mentioned it here because I feel other provincial branches can also follow it with benefit.

V.T. Raju (Hyderabad) : The Report should have indicated clearly the fundamental issues on which the Party has split. The number and names of those who have deserted the Party should also have been given. How many and who, again, have gone over to the Congress?

The Report makes no mention of the Patna firing and the glorious role played by our Bihar Branch in the events that followed it. Jayaprakash Narayan had issued a momentous and epoch-making statement on the issue, but the Report does not even notice it.

The PSP is playing a notable job in some of the important municipal corporations of the country, for instance in Bombay. Any party would be proud of the work being done by the Municipal Section of our Party there. The Report should have at least made a reference to it.

The Bhoodan movement has also not come up for any assessment or mention in the Report. Our most important leader, Jayaprakash Narayan, is devoting his whole time and energy to it. It is mostly due to his inspiring guidance that the movement has been able to make such a headway in such a short time. We are proud of his part in it. Why should the Report not have referred to it?

Sibnath Banerji (West Bengal) : The total number of Party members has been given in the Report as 1,89,339. But

comparative figures for the last year have not been given. How is one to get an idea whether the Party has been functioning properly or not? The Report may also have usefully given an analysis of members who are active and who are working among labour, kisan and youth. The Bhoodan movement has also not been referred to. How many of our workers are actively engaged in this movement?

I think it should have been possible for the General Secretary to give definite information about the number of our members who have gone over to Lohia or to the Congress or have become inactive during the last year. The Report should also have suggested some method of bringing the old friends back into the Party fold. We should try our best to win them over, if possible.

In dealing with a crisis of this magnitude the National Executive should have taken a larger body into confidence. A meeting of the General Council, which has not been called since Indore, should have been held, even if technically it has no competence in disciplinary matters. It would have strengthened the hands of the Executive. The Report does not give any reason to show why a meeting of the General Council was not called.

Purshottam Trikamdas (Bombay City) : I congratulate the General Secretary on having prepared a factual Report, although one can point to various omissions. There may also be certain points on which one may not agree with the General Secretary. I refer in particular to the passage on page 16 wherein it is stated that the people are looking to the PSP for a change in the country's government. I do not think the country is so tired of the present government as to seek a change. It would be a gross exaggeration to say that the country is looking to us for a change, though the position was radically different some time ago. And the Party is itself responsible for this unfortunate outcome. I am sorry to say this, but I am only stating the facts.

The split in the Party, it is my considered opinion, could have been avoided if the Party had acted promptly and with resolution at an early stage. Pampering of individuals and their vanity cannot but end up in a sorry mess. Indiscipline should have been nipped in the bud. We have never paid adequate attention to the needs of discipline and organisation. Questions of policy and doctrine have been our main preoccupations. This is not the way to build up a democratic party.

Satyagraha is a great weapon, but it is not to be lightly treated. It is not the only weapon in our armoury. There are many other ways of establishing and promoting contact with the people. Exclusive attention to satyagraha at the cost of other methods of building up the Party has resulted in a considerable imbalance and threatens to impede our progress.

The Report should have mentioned some of the recent events in Bombay connected with the agitation arising out of the SRC

Proposals. It was distressing to find the PSP joining hands with the Communists in the conduct of the agitation. The peaceful agitation there degenerated into arson and worse. It could not have been otherwise with the Communists occupying positions of vantage in the movement. These happenings have certainly not added to the prestige of the Party.

Vedanta Hemmiga (Mysore) : As many as 50 MLAs have left the Party. It appears the National Executive did not select proper candidates for the elections. We shall have to be much more careful in future. Men of principle alone should be selected.

Party journals and literature are published mostly in English and Hindi. Party literature should be published in all the principal languages of India and their prices should be within the reach of the common man.

Accounts at provincial and district level are not always properly maintained. There is need for vigilance on this score. The Central office should exercise greater scrutiny over provincial branches.

Mathuradas Mehta (Bombay City) : It is apparent from the Report that the financial position of the Party is not at all sound. But the National Executive does not seem to have paid much attention to it. This is deplorable. Lack of adequate financial resources leads to general lethargy and apathy in the Party ranks. We have to make a determined bid to overcome it. The General Elections are drawing near and we should sink all our differences and mobilise all our resources to acquit ourselves creditably in the great electoral battle. For this purpose we need the inspiring leadership of a person like Jayaprakash Narayan. He alone can fulfil the hopes and aspirations of the masses. I am sure if we jointly plead with him he will not disappoint us.

Ganga Sahai Chaube (Uttar Pradesh) : The General Secretary has presented us with a factual report and I congratulate him on this account.

I want to clarify the position in regard to the Kanpur textile strike and the joint front with the Communist Party during it. The fact is that they offered their help. How could we reject it in the midst of a movement within bounds? In spite of the joint front with the Communists there was not a single incident of violence or arson on the part of labour. We are greatly handicapped in our work by the Party's failure to draw up a clear and precise labour policy. Do we want to run the labour movement on independent lines, free from any control or interference from political parties? If that is our policy, then how can we criticise our trade union workers for not having adhered strictly to the Party's policy?

The strength and discipline of our Party are not up to the mark. We must have a volunteer organisation. The Congress

achieved success mainly because of their volunteer organisations. It is rather surprising that our Party is not wide awake in this matter.

We also need a separate organisation for the students. We cannot organise them properly or attract them to us through the general youth organisations.

Navalchand Toksia (Madhya Pradesh) : We cannot afford to neglect women. They constitute 50 per cent of the voters and we must put in our best efforts to win their support for the Party. The General Secretary should have thrown some light on this problem.

In regard to Goa, I feel that our policy has been a failure. We should have adopted a more definite policy. The continued incarceration of men like N. G. Goray and Ishwarlal Desai is a challenge to our self-respect. We cannot remain silent spectators of the atrocities committed by the Portuguese.

Virendra Bahadur Singh (Uttar Pradesh) : The Report is very sketchy. We had expected a comprehensive summing up from the General Secretary. Had he dealt exhaustively with the different fields of our activities the personal bickerings of some of the Party members in these fields would have been exposed. Jayaprakash Narayan gave up his work in Railways, Posts and Telegraphs and Defence workers. G. G. Mehta quitted the Bank Employees Federation and other trade unions. Why did this all happen? The causes lie much deeper. Unless we go to the roots we will not be able to make headway.

Rajaram Shastri (Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh) : The Report has been efficiently drafted in spite of some lapses, and I congratulate the General Secretary on his achievement.

Some allegations have been made here about entering into an alliance with the Communists during the parliamentary by-election in Kanpur. I was the Party Candidate there. It is a fact that the Communists helped us. When they offered help, how could I have rejected it? But we had our own ideology and programme. The Chairman, Acharya Narendra Deva, had also given us clear instructions in this regard and I am confident that we carried out his instructions according to the best of our ability.

The textile strike in Kanpur was sponsored neither by the Communists nor by the Party. It was led by the Suti Mill Mazdoor Sabha. There used to be three separate unions. We have now formed one big union. I believe the Party has always advocated this line. I am sure we did not commit any wrong.

M. R. Dandavate (Bombay City) : I will not take much time since the General Secretary has been quite elaborate in his Report. I am impelled to speak only because of the reference by delegates to the linguistic agitation in Bombay as that is likely

to create misunderstanding about the Bombay PSP. The decision to organise a march to the Bombay Assembly on the 18th November was taken at the North Bombay Citizens' Samyukta Maharashtra Conference organised by members of different political parties and held under the chairmanship of S.M. Joshi. At this conference an action committee consisting of members of different political parties was formed. It is wrong to characterise the action committee as a restricted united front with the Communists. The demonstration on the 18th November was peaceful. But the police teargassed the demonstrators and displayed unwarranted show of force which generated great resentment. The decision to give a call for general strike on the 21st November followed. The industrial workers went on strike without any coercion from others. Later on, the crowds in the streets began to converge towards the Assembly. We were able to control the situation in certain localities but at some places there was stone-throwing. In the course of the day four empty buses were also burnt. When the crowds assembled at Flora Fountain the police attacked the defiant crowds with teargas and a little later the home guards opened fire indiscriminately. I wish some of the speakers here who have talked about the violence committed by the people had said something about the excesses committed by the police and the home guards. At the Special Conference of the Party held at Nagpur we had formulated our attitude towards the problems of law and order and police firings in free and democratic India. The crucial test of our resolutions is in the application of our generalised attitudes to concrete situations. In the resolution passed by the Bombay PSP after the demonstration of 21st November it was categorically stated that but for the behaviour of the police and the home guards a lot of trouble could have been avoided. It was a matter of pride for the PSP that when the bullets of the home guards failed to restore peace and order the courageous leadership of S. M. Joshi and Amul Desai could bring the situation under control and they could succeed in leading thousands of people from the trouble spot to Chowpatty where a mammoth meeting was held without any further incident.

I am definitely of the opinion that after we have decided upon a certain policy after mature consideration we should stick to it and not deviate from the chosen path. Ours is not a party of liberals which can afford merely to pass resolutions condemning acts of injustice. Wherever there is injustice we must fight against it through peaceful and democratic means. Only by providing a peaceful alternative to violent methods of agitation can we prevent the outburst of violence and hooliganism.

GENERAL SECRETARY'S REPLY TO THE DEBATE

Triloki Singh : I could draft the Report only on the basis of information available in the office. In the absence of regular reports from the provincial branches narration of many im-

portant activities had to be omitted. I am, however, grateful to the delegates for supplying information now. I will incorporate it in my Report.

The Central Office did not receive any quota out of active membership fees. Nor has the Central Office received any information about the number of active members in the various provinces. The figures therefore could not be given.

This is a report of Party activities during the year. The weak links in the Party organisation are mentioned therein. There is no question of exposing the weaknesses of the Party or indulging in personal bickerings. I had purposely avoided any reference to personal bickerings.

In regard to the achievements of our ministry in Travancore-Cochin, it was not possible to bring out any pamphlet or otherwise publicise them when the Party was actually in office. It generally takes some time to assess the work of any government. Unfortunately, the ministry fell before we could properly assess and evaluate its work. We could not therefore publish anything at an earlier stage.

The total membership last year was 262,000. There has been thus a fall of 80,000 members. Uttar Pradesh alone is responsible for a fall of 30,000. This fall, it is notable, came about before the Party split. The fall therefore cannot be attributed to the split. It is for the Conference to devise ways and means to increase Party membership. I personally feel that without a recruitment campaign throughout the year, instead of concentrating on it during the closing months, we will not be able to show better results.

I have taken note of the various errors in figures relating to the number of members in the Union and State Legislatures. These errors will be corrected.

We had wanted to formulate a definite policy relating to labour. With this end in view we had decided to convene a representative meeting of our prominent trade union workers in different parts of the country. But the meeting did not come off as there was no response from most of the provinces.

The National Executive met as often as it was necessary for it to do so. India is a land of great distances and it is not possible for members of the National Executive to undertake long journeys every month. Many of them cannot afford the expenses involved. Nevertheless, the National Executive has been meeting quite often.

I do not know what is the basis of the information of the delegates who had asserted that some meetings of the National Executive did not have even a quorum. At least I do not know of any such meeting. It is a fact that no meeting was attended by all the members. This is not an unusual phenomenon. But we never lacked quorum. On the other hand, attendance was fairly good.

In regard to the General Council I have to point out that according to the constitution the General Council should

meet once between two National Conferences of the Party. This provision has been fully complied with. A special meeting of the General Council can be called on a requisition by a certain fixed number of its members. But no such requisition was ever made. The National Executive did not call a second meeting of the General Council because the controversy in the past year arose out of questions of discipline and not of ideology. In matters of discipline, however, the General Council has no competence. The National Executive alone has the authority to deal with disciplinary questions.

In the end I would again say that I have taken note of the information supplied by delegates here. It will find its proper place in the finalised Report.

The Conference then adjourned.

TUESDAY—DECEMBER 27, 1955

AFTERNOON—DELEGATES SESSION

The Conference reassembled at 2-30 p.m.

The Chairman called upon Jayaprakash Narayan to address the Conference.

Jayaprakash Narayan: I have not much to say except to make a personal explanation. I had announced my decision to retire from active party politics—power politics—at the time of the Bodh Gaya Sarvodaya Sammelan. I had made clear at that time that, although I would retain my membership of the PSP and attend meetings of the National Executive if invited, I would not campaign on behalf of the Party. Since then I have repeated it many a time. But unfortunately I find that I am not being taken seriously by my friends and colleagues in the Party. I continue to receive telegrams and letters, even resolutions, from Party branches calling upon me to come back to party politics. Last evening the Chairman of the Reception Committee made a public appeal to me. New slogans have also been coined. It started at the Provincial Conference of the Uttar Pradesh PSP at Banaras. Slogans like *Samajwad Ayega, Jayaprakash Layega* were raised even at Gaya. *Samajwad* (Socialism) will come. But Jayaprakash has no magic wand with the aid of which he can usher it in. It is the people alone who can do it, not any individual. Let us understand it once for all. Slogans like these not only disturb me beyond description but tend to create among Party ranks and the people at large false hopes and unhealthy tendencies. I do not want to say “No” to my friends and life-long

colleagues again and again. It hurts me to do it. It upsets me emotionally. But I am left with no option when I am pressed again and again in a public and demonstrative manner. Perhaps you imagine that I need being asked a sufficient number of times. I can assure you I do not need any invitation to start working actively for the Party which I have helped to found and nourish with my life-blood and which even today I consider to be the best political party in the country. I would therefore like to make one final attempt to clarify my position.

I did not take this decision on account of anything that happened in the Party. It is true I do not like much that has happened. It is true it has had its effect on me. Any individual would be affected by it. But these happenings had nothing to do with the decision at Bodh Gaya. That was an independent decision taken after mature consideration. It was neither a product of despair nor of impatience or personal vanity. What led me to take this decision? It is a long story and there is no time today to go into it. Suffice it to say that the reasons were not personal and that under no circumstances shall I come back to active party politics as it is understood today. I would humbly request you not to depend on me. I also sincerely believe that you *need* not depend on me. There are enough talented, sincere and hard-working men of stature in the Party to lead it to its destiny. No other political party in the country has so many fine, selfless and devoted workers. The Party has a definite place in the political life of the country. I would urge you to know and recognise your innate strength and dispel all lack of self-confidence. Otherwise, you would not only harm the Party but also harm the cause you have been espousing all these years. I have not resigned from Party membership. Perhaps it would have been better if I had done so. Then perhaps you might have ceased to look to me for strength. It might indeed have helped you to become more self-reliant. That moment, however, is gone. Today I continue to be a Party member. I cannot say definitely what will happen in the future. Perhaps I would like to retain my membership, although sometimes I feel like giving it up. Indeed, if Lohia had not created confusion and disruption in the Party, I might have already ceased to be a Party member. There is however another reason why I continue to maintain this link with the Praja Socialist Party. Even though I am working for a non-party political system and a stateless society, today the political parties are there. They are a reality. One cannot wish them out of existence. And, as long as other political parties exist, the Praja Socialist Party will also continue to exist. In fact, its need will be all the greater. It has a definite role to play, a historic task to perform. It is a historic necessity. That is why I have never advocated its dissolution. Nor can I rationally take up the attitude of equal indifference or detachment to all political parties. I cannot with honesty say that all political parties in the country today are equally bad or equally good. They differ fundamentally in their

basic outlook, concepts of social change and means to achieve their objectives. There are parties which believe in non-violence. There are others that cling to capitalism or are wedded to narrow communalism. Then there is the Praja Socialist Party. How can anyone equate them? At least, I do not find it possible to do so. And, as long as different political parties exist, every citizen in a democratic country has to make a choice, at least at the time of elections. My choice is made. The fact that I have retained my membership of the Praja Socialist Party indicates my choice.

A word about the Party. I do not think that under the present circumstances the Party can achieve anything spectacular on an all-India scale. There are greater possibilities if you are more realistic and take up local work in right earnest. Let us not repeat the mistake we committed during the last General Elections. We overestimated our strength and frittered away our energies and resources. The result was disastrous. Some of the topmost leaders of the then Socialist Party and the KMPP were defeated at the polls. It was apparent that what really mattered in the elections was not the national standing of the candidate but his daily contact with the people. Once again we are on the eve of General Elections. Let us learn from our experience and select our constituencies. Without making any fuss about it let us concentrate on a limited number of constituencies and make a determined bid to capture them, to stake our all on the effort. I would even advise you to make a preliminary selection of the candidates so that they at least may have real interest in nursing their constituencies on the basis of local work. This selection of constituencies and candidates will of course have to be as realistic as we can possibly make it. If this is done I have no doubt in my mind that the Party will grow from strength to strength.

I would have liked to talk to you in detail about my unorthodox ideas, but there is hardly any time for it today.

One thing however I would like to clarify. I have not turned an ascetic or become a yogi. I do not believe that it is necessary for anyone to renounce the world in order to be able to serve mankind. On the contrary, I believe that it is necessary to try to change the world while living in it. There may be others who believe in renunciation. But that is not my way. I have my family and other social responsibilities. And I do not propose to renounce them. I am part of the society, not aloof from it or above it. My attempt is to bring about a fundamental change in society while continuing to remain in it, not from outside.

Many a friend has come and talked to me, argued with me. I am grateful to them. But sometimes an attempt is made to teach me even elementary things. "How can anyone isolate himself from politics in modern times?" I have been told this again and again. I would beg to submit that I am not incapable of understanding and appreciating these basic facts. I am not

trying to isolate myself from politics in the wide sense. I have often said that *Bhoodan* has its own politics which is much deeper than the politics of the current political parties. If *Bhoodan* comes out to be successful I have no doubt in my mind that it will shake our society to its very foundations. It will be the first real social revolution in history. This politics, however, is different from partisan and power politics. And it is from the latter type of politics that I have decided to isolate myself.

A few words about socialism in Asia. It has often been recognised that Asian socialism will have to be fundamentally different from what is understood by this term in the West. Mr. Attlee also recognised the fact while speaking at the first Asian Socialist Conference in Rangoon. But how will it be different? In what form and shape? In what respects? We have to consider these points dispassionately and work out the patterns. It is not enough just to say that Asian socialism will be different.

Asia is predominantly agricultural and in this it is basically different from the West. Modern industrial revolution started in the West more than two centuries ago. Capitalism was mainly responsible for it. Its motive force was derived from private capitalistic enterprise. This led to many contradictions and *untold misery for the working classes*. Socialist thinkers, therefore, came to believe that capitalism had outplayed its utility and that it had become a fetter on further progress. Forces of production, generated by capitalism, could not develop further unless the capitalistic relations of production broke down and yielded place to more suitable relations. They, therefore, came to the conclusion that destruction of capitalism was a historical necessity and inevitable as it was barring further economic and social progress. This, briefly, is at the base of all western socialist thought. But conditions in Asia are radically different. Asian countries, by and large, have not gone through such industrial revolutions and development. In India 80 per cent of the population lives in villages. Incidentally they command 80 per cent of the votes as well. But strangely enough no one, no political party, today tries to understand and appreciate their problems. If we can appreciate their needs and desires, we may have to tear up all our carefully drawn up plans and schemes of economic reconstruction. This is true about today. What will happen in the future I cannot say.

What will be the concepts and fundamental urges of Asian socialism if and when we also pass through a comparable industrial revolution, I cannot say. All that I want to say today is that you are not trying to draw up a picture of socialism in tune with the existing situation. You are refusing even to understand the task. I may not be an actual tiller of the soil, but I am trying to look at our economic and social problems from his point of view; and I want to impress on you the necessity, the absolute urgency, of understanding his needs and desires, his hopes and aspirations, his point of view. You may be able to impose your plans on him with the help of State power and call it

socialism. But I can assure you he will have nothing to do with this kind of socialism. I am not talking of the cities and towns. I am talking of the villages and the village folk, with the help of whose votes you hope to capture power and reshape the destiny of India.

The Government of India is pushing ahead with its scheme of community projects. You are also doing something in the rural areas. Maybe there will be nationalisation. Maybe there will be industrialisation. But can you really hope to usher in socialism, socialism for the Asian masses, by these means? I would beg you to give a cool and mature consideration to these problems. I would place before you what is my picture of socialism and what type of popular campaigns would be necessary to further its cause.

As a socialist I believe that all property is social and should belong to society as a whole. Land constitutes the basic means of production and private owning in the villages. But its distribution is inequitable. I would like to bring about a fundamental change in this structure. The first step in this direction would be to abolish private property in land, the principal means of production in villages. Land should belong to the village as a whole. It is true that hunger and squalour are to be found everywhere. But it is equally true that, on the one hand, there is hunger and starvation and, on the other, huge blocks of land lie uncultivated. This anomaly, this basic contradiction in our social structure, has to go. But how do we do it? Evidently, the first thing to do is to redistribute land on an equitable basis. All those who live in villages have to be provided with land. They have also to be enabled to produce and earn something from subsidiary cottage industries. The latter is as essential as the former. Land cannot provide us with everything. We cannot expect it to yield to the peasants means enough for buying cars and other luxuries and modern comforts. Land cannot give us anything more than food and clothing. We shall have to increase its productivity and make provision for water and fertilisers even for getting this much out of it. If we want to have more we will have to depend on industries for that.

After having socialised or rather villagised land, the next question that crops up is of the mode of cultivation. To a socialist, the collective mode of cultivation comes as the natural answer. But it is not such a simple question. What will happen if we go in for collectivisation today? With prevailing mass illiteracy, collectivisation would only serve to throw up a new village aristocracy, a new class of feudal lords. Paid managers and bureaucrats will evolve into a new ruling coterie. Honesty and revolutionary pioneering zeal would be at a discount. This is exactly what has happened in the Soviet Union. Israel may have a different story to tell. But let us not forget that Israel had a unique set of circumstances which we cannot repeat here. Collectivisation may have better chances in a population which

has much higher cultural and educational standards and where the co-operative spirit and pioneering zeal are on top. Do we have these? Our rural population will not even be able to understand the complicated methods of evaluation and distribution of produce in a collective farm. We cannot make a success of it under the existing conditions. That is why we propose to vest the ownership of land in the village community but retain individual farming. Collective farming can take place on a separate piece of land, the produce of which can meet the collective needs of the community and the revenue charges of the government.

Under this scheme cultivation will necessarily have to be on a small scale, because our land resources are limited. These individually worked small farms can easily co-operate together in matters of irrigation, finance, seeds, manure, marketing, etc. Redistribution of the land will take place after every ten or twenty years and necessary readjustments made. Thus, collective or village ownership of the land, family cultivation, and co-operation in financing, marketing etc.—this is the pattern of socialist agriculture that I have in mind. This socialist agriculture plus cottage industry, will be the pattern of rural socialism embracing 80% of the people of India.

This is my picture of a socialist village, or, if you wish, of a village based on Sarvodaya.

Here I would like to remove one misconception. It is sometimes alleged that Sarvodaya stands for poverty, that it worships poverty. There is nothing farther from truth than this. We are not worshippers of poverty. We would like property to increase. We have also no quarrel with attempts to raise the standard of living. But we do not believe that the be-all and end-all of human civilisation is endlessly to strive for a perpetual rise in our standard of living. The United States and the Soviet Union may have placed this ideal before them. We do not have this ideal. We would certainly like to provide everyone with food, clothing, shelter, education and other basic necessities of life. But we refuse to acknowledge them as our gods. Unless we understand and appreciate this we would not be able to devote any fruitful thought to the problem of the evolution of human personality.

In India, the standard of living is so low that it seems to be irrelevant to speak about voluntary limitation of wants. There is no doubt that our first task is to satisfy the wants of our people and to raise their standard of living. But while doing this it is necessary, if we are not to lose our bearings, to remember that artificial and endless multiplication of wants and the consequent race to satisfy them cannot be our ideal.

It is again thought that our insistence on village and cottage industries means that we are insisting on hugging poverty. Nothing again can be farther from the truth. The trouble is that the critics are not looking at the problem from the villagers' point of view.

Efforts are being made to build industries in the towns. But the growth of wealth in the towns is not going to add to the wealth in the village. The land-man ratio is one acre per head. There is no possibility of increasing this ratio and giving more land to the villager. With the growth of population, the pressure on the land is going to increase, despite industrialisation in the towns. Because of the unfavourable land-man ratio and lack of irrigation facilities, the cultivators are unemployed for a greater part of the year. It is obvious therefore that, if rural standards of living are to be raised, productive employment must be provided to every rural home. This can be done only through village industries. There is no other way to raise the 80 per cent of our people from the abyss of poverty in which they find themselves today. The whole discussion whether small industries or large industries can raise living standards faster is irrelevant to our rural context. In addition to industries which every cottage must be provided with, there may be necessary some industries which may be on a village basis. Such industries should not be individually owned, but they should be owned by the whole village. I would not want them to be owned even by co-operatives that exclude some families in the villages. Like land, village industries also should belong to the village. I have no faith left in a socialism that does not provide work to villagers in their villages. Nor do I have any use for such an economic policy or ideology.

Agrarian socialism is the need of the hour. We have to draw up a plan that can give productive work and employment to all within a short period of four to five years. We cannot wait for decades for the developmental processes to bloom into fruition. That will be suicidal. We have to make good with what little we have and draw up our plans on that basis.

We do not want to isolate ourselves from the world. But we do want to be self-sufficient and independent as far as possible. We have no quarrel with the equal independence of others. We want our villages to be self-sufficient and independent according to our conception. In such a village, the village community will manage practically all village affairs—economic, political, social.

This is my picture of Agrarian Socialism. I do not want to turn my back on science. But I am not prepared to acknowledge it as my master. Man and his good are the real masters. Everything else is subservient to them.

The next important question is how to reach this goal. Modern social thinking stops at parties and their struggle for power. Different interests or ideals organise themselves into appropriate political parties, canvass public support and try to capture the State, with or without the approval and support of a majority of the population. Methods may be either insurrectionary or democratic. They, however, essentially boil down to the same essence—capture of power. Having captured power, an attempt is made to alter the socio-economic structure with the help of that power. This method, I would beg to submit, has been

tried and found wanting, particularly in countries with low levels of cultural and social standards. I have therefore come to believe that we cannot reach our goal by merely imposing changes from above. The process has to begin from below. The masses have to be moved and brought into action, not merely to capture power but to carry out the desired changes without the help of the power of the State and by bringing about a fundamental change in their outlook on life. If the masses act in this manner, if they are really conscious of the needs of the situation and their duties and responsibilities, it would be almost immaterial as to *who controls the State power*. Whoever is in power, if the masses are conscious and active, he will have to bow to them and help in the implementation of their wishes.

That is why I believe that our foremost task today is to move the masses and change their outlook, particularly the rural masses, because they constitute about 80 per cent of our population. The *Bhoodan* movement offers you such a programme for changing and moving the rural masses. A movement for the redistribution of land—not in the future when power has been captured, but here and now and not by force of law but by a change in the very concept of property—is a movement which socialists should seize upon and make their own. I have told you how *Bhoodan* is emerging into *Gramdan*. There can be no better agrarian programme for a socialist party than *Gramdan*. I therefore humbly suggest that you plunge into this movement heart and soul. Select a few thousand villages in the country and see that individual ownership of land is replaced there with community ownership. Make these villages the workshops of socialism. If you do this, you will have something concrete to do, instead of talking about establishing socialism when you have been elected to power. Start building socialism here and now. If you succeed in establishing socialism in a few thousand villages, the movement will spread and eventually embrace the whole country.

This, friends, is the programme that, in all humility, I wish to place before you for your earnest consideration.

RESOLUTION ON POLITICAL SITUATION

The Chairman called upon Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani to move the resolution on Political Situation.

Sucheta Kripalani (Delhi) : Moving the resolution, she said : It is a matter of great concern that the Congress Party is taking to autocratic and totalitarian rather than to democratic methods in running the government. The Congress is governing the country in a most undemocratic manner. The common man does not feel that he is in any way participating in the administration of the country or that the government is being run for his good. Injustice is increasing. The common man is groaning under the topheavy administrative machinery and the tyranny of both the police and Congress bosses.

The Congress ministers behave as though there is no difference between the government and their party. Whenever they go for any party work, the government machinery and the exchequer is freely used. During the last General Elections and during several by-elections in the last three years, ministers have been seen freely making use of the governmental machinery for the benefit of the Congress Party. In the last General Elections the officials went even to small villages on the pretext of government work just to obtain support for the Congress Party.

The welfare activities in the country are utilised by Congress legislators to nurse their constituencies. Even development projects are regarded as the close preserves of Congressmen.

The Congress Party itself has assumed a totalitarian form. It is controlled by one single person. The whole policy is guided by him alone. His wishes are carried out as law. Even the Union Cabinet is not a Cabinet in the true sense. There seems to be only one minister in the Central Cabinet. The rest are all yes-men. Thus one single individual rules supreme in this country.

It is said socialism is emerging in the country and the industries are being socialised. But in actual fact, all the State enterprises are not run in the socialistic way. The administrative pattern is the same as that of private enterprise. Members of the Indian Civil Service are in charge of these enterprises, they are paid large salaries and have supreme control over the management. There is no workers' participation in the management and labour is treated shabbily.

The Congress policies have resulted in breaking the trade unions. They are indirectly controlled by the government. The INTUC receives the support of the Government. Even in industries where unions are functioning efficiently and with the general support of the workers, rival INTUC unions are started with the help of employers.

In India there is a huge disparity in the income of the rich and the poor. In other countries, e.g., Israel and Sweden there are differences of 1 : 2 and 1 : 4 respectively. But in our country no attempt is made by the government to remove the inequality in the incomes either in the services or in the industrial field.

Democracy requires for its success and existence awakened public opinion. But the means that foster public opinion such as the radio is entirely controlled by the government and used in the interest of the Congress Party. Even the press is not free. Government control over the press has increasingly strengthened since the attainment of freedom. Newspapers that criticise the government's policies, shortcomings or misrule are driven out of the field.

The record of Congress Government in the matter of Goa has been most ignoble. The entire country stood united for the freedom of Goa. Fight against Portuguese imperialism took the shape of a national struggle. There was a tremendous upsurge

all over the country. All the political parties with the exception of Congress participated in the Goa struggle. They faced bullets cheerfully for the freedom of their brethren inside Goa. This alarmed Shri Nehru. He thought the initiative had passed into the hands of opposition parties in mobilising the public opinion. Therefore, the Goa struggle was deliberately sabotaged by the Congress.

In Manipur the Congress Government deliberately denied democracy to the people who had attained democracy during the rule of the Raja. Their legitimate demand for the restoration of the democratic form of Government was answered by lathis and bullets by the Congress Government.

In the face of all these things, there is no need to be frustrated. All of you young people who have assembled in Gaya in such a large number should accept the challenge and march ahead boldly to save democracy in India. Democracy is a pre-requisite of socialism. If real democracy is established in India, then the advent of socialism will be easier. In democracy the real masters are the masses. It is our duty to approach the people and educate them so that they are neither misguided nor coerced. Let us create consciousness among them. So long as the masses are ignorant, real democracy cannot prevail. Therefore, being the torch-bearers of a dynamic party which has always been in the forefront in fighting injustice, oppression and autocracy in the service of the downtrodden you should march ahead. Success will be yours.

Samar Guha (West Bengal) : Seconding the resolution, Samar Guha said : By merely criticising the Congress it is not possible to check totalitarianism. We have been taxed by internal conflicts, and in spite of that we have not lagged in serving the people. We have led them to action. We should give a clear picture—cultural, political and socialist—to the people so that they may understand our mind, policy and programme. In that way we can liquidate Congress totalitarianism. A certificate from Chou En-lai and Bulganin and Khrushchev may be good for Shri Nehru, but the rising unemployment and other difficulties facing the country will one day result in swallowing the bubble of Nehru's democracy.

Harihar Bahinipati (Utkal) : The resolution from the beginning to the end is negative. It does not contain any positive idea or constructive suggestions to be placed before the people. The last para betrays a defeatist outlook as if we are not in a position to take power. Therefore the last para should be deleted.

Shanti Aich (West Bengal) : The tone of the speakers on the resolution is different from the tone of the resolution itself. Instead of criticising others we should have given constructive programmes.

K. N. Nagarkatti (Madhya Pradesh) : The resolution is silent on the method of attack by the ruling party on us and therefore I come forward with my amendment in this regard, i.e., "indulging in gross misrule of process of law".

Ahmadi (Uttar Pradesh) : It is rather surprising that the resolution says that we are to be only an opposition. We never asked people to vote for us just to form an opposition. Therefore, instead of *democratic opposition* I propose that the words *build up a Socialist Party* be used. We are quite sure of forming an alternative government. Hence for the word *opposition* the word *government* be substituted in the last para.

Pitambarnath Kaushik (Uttar Pradesh) : The general public does not understand the conception and real meaning of socialism at present and this has resulted in unnecessary and unwanted groups. People are apt to run after individual leaders rather than ideology. When our leaders put before the public their ideology, policy and programme then they will willingly place the power in our hands. The Congress leaders today claim their government has started big projects, but actual gain to the people is yet a dream. We are taxed heavily but get nothing in return. We only get sorrow, difficulties and troubles. The resolution as proposed is good. Therefore I support it.

Manindranath Bose (West Bengal) : I would suggest the redrafting of the whole resolution. Unless we have a full analysis of the situation it would not be advisable to pass any resolution in such a manner. It is rather a pity that the conclusion that has been drawn and that has been placed before us is disappointing. We have come here from long distances to get some inspiration from this Conference, but this resolution does not give us that inspiration. While other political parties claim to form a government, we consider it to be sufficient to form an opposition. So I feel that, if not the whole, at least the last para of the resolution should be redrafted.

The Chairman announced that the following two amendments by Karpoori Thakur (Bihar) had been accepted by the mover :

1. In para 5, delete the last sentence and add : *This Conference appeals to its members to pursue the constructive efforts with vigour and continuity and to intensify the fight against injustices through peaceful and democratic means.*
2. In the last para delete the words *when needed and desired.*

Raja Kulkarni (Bombay City) : In para 2, after the words *trade unions*, add *co-operatives, professional trade associations of voluntary nature.*

This amendment was also accepted by the mover.

Sucheta Kripalani then rose to reply to the debate.

Sucheta Kripalani (Delhi) : I have not much to say. Ahmadi's amendment it seems has been tabled in haste. He does not seem to have read the resolution carefully. We are today in opposition. If we mobilise our strength, then alone can we aspire to replace the present government. The resolution deals with the existing situation only and does not deal with the future policy which will be dealt in the Policy Statement that is going to be placed before the delegates. Correct appraisal of the present situation in the country is given in the resolution. Also a lead has been given not only to the Party workers but also to the people of this country. There is no need to suffer from inferiority complex. You should accept the resolution as amended and reject the amendments moved.

Ahmadi's amendment was then put to vote and lost by majority.

Manindranath Bose's amendment was also lost by an overwhelming majority.

The amendments of Ahmadi, Manindranath Bose and Nagar-katti were then put to vote and were lost by large majority.

RESOLUTION ON ECONOMIC SITUATION

Karpoori Thakur (Bihar) : Moving the resolution on Economic Situation, Karpoori Thakur said : It is worth pointing out that in spite of government's pleadings and claims about the success in achieving the targets in the First Five Year Plan, we find that the situation is not so happy, nor the common man's lot has been improved. Economic progress and food production targets have been achieved in South East Asian countries and continental countries also. Countries destroyed by the second world war have revitalised their economy. But in India, in spite of huge resources, the economic stagnation continues. Our economy, according to Dr. V.K.R.V. Rao, is a stagnant economy in progress.

The production increase has not so far resulted in bringing down the prices to bring adequate relief to consumers. Agricultural prices have gone down, while the prices of manufactured goods remain high. The burden on the poorer classes not only remain but have grown. The profits of large-scale manufacturers have increased and are still going up. The government has been spending millions of rupees on large-scale industries while small-scale industries have been given only nominal funds. It seems the government somehow does not want to give encouragement to the small-scale industries that it deserves.

It is also curious that, while production has increased, unemployment has also increased by about five million during the period of the First Plan.

Therefore you should measure the economic progress not on the basis of propaganda but by actual improvements brought about in the work and earnings of the common man.

A. Subramaniam of Tamilnad seconded the resolution.

Kenchappa (Mysore) : In my opinion the resolution needs redrafting.

The delegates refused to accept amendments though accepted by the mover. The original resolution was then put to vote and carried by an overwhelming majority.

The Conference then adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1955

MORNING—DELEGATES SESSION

The Conference reassembled at 9 a.m.

DISCUSSION ON KAMATH COMMITTEE REPORT

The Chairman called upon S. M. Joshi to move the Kamath Committee Report and the resolution on the Report.

S. M. Joshi (Maharashtra) : The resolution is very clear and I do not intend to deliver a long speech before you.

You all know how the Kamath Committee came to be appointed. When the PSP Ministry was in power in Travancore-Cochin an unfortunate incident of police firing on unruly crowds had taken place. The National Executive offered their apologies to the people of Travancore-Cochin and directed the Ministry to appoint a Judicial Committee of Enquiry. This was done. The National Executive also appointed a Committee to go into the whole question of the maintenance of law and order in a democratic state. The Committee went into the whole question with a characteristic thoroughness and produced a valuable document known as the Kamath Committee Report.

The Travancore-Cochin firing led to a great deal of trouble in the PSP and the National Executive had to convene a Special Conference to decide the issue finally. But something good always emerges out of strife and turmoil. The Party set up a great precedent of democratic practice thereby distinguishing itself from the bureaucratic administration of the Congress. The PSP Ministry held a Judicial Enquiry into the firing and established a healthy democratic principle that a judicial enquiry should automatically follow any firing. But the Congress refuses to accept

this democratic principle. At the Avadi Session of the Congress a non-official resolution accepting this principle was sought to be moved by a delegate, but it was suppressed by Jawaharlal Nehru.

Since then firing has been resorted to at many places in the country under the Congress regime. Police, it is true, has to maintain law and order. But can we leave it entirely to the discretion of the police? Burke had once said that when there is widespread disorder in a society, the presumption must always be in favour of the people and against the government. The government cannot shirk its responsibility.

Patna and Bombay have recently experienced unpardonable firing. In the case of Bombay the Government have refused even to hold a judicial enquiry. I was there on that day and I can say from personal knowledge that there was no justification for indiscriminate firing. The police did not indulge in firing but the home guards did. Oddly enough, at one place the firing was opened by the home guards from behind when the Superintendent of Police was advancing towards the crowd through a sort of no-man's land at the Flora Fountain in an effort to pacify and control it. The Superintendent of Police could save himself only by promptly lying on the ground. The firing was most indiscriminate and wanton.

The Praja Socialist Party is the first political party in India to give a serious thought to this problem. What are the circumstances under which firing by the authorities can be considered to be justifiable? What existing rules need to be changed and new ones added? All these questions have been considered by the Kamath Committee. Their Report has been published in the press and circulated to different political and social organisations. Response so far has been not very encouraging. But this is an aspect of administration on which the Praja Socialist Party wants to cultivate a definite climate of public opinion. In this context this Report assumes historic significance and I have great pleasure in strongly commending it to the Conference.

Surendranath Dwivedy (Utkal) seconding the resolution said: This is a document of historic importance. It has already been considered by our provincial and district branches. The problem discussed by the Kamath Committee has many aspects. It is not merely an administrative problem. It is a question of building up a sound democratic order in the country. It is a pity that the Congress Government's attitude to the question of the maintenance of law and order is as bureaucratic as the attitude of the British Government in India. It was for the Congress Government to evolve a democratic police code and lay down precise regulations which are in accord with the democratic set-up and values. The Report has made a valuable contribution to this process. I wish the Government could accept it.

Sarangdhar Das (Utkal) : I have nothing much to say after the speeches of two of my colleagues. I would, however,

stress one point. The military and the police are both bound by a definite code of discipline. But what about the home guards in the different States of the Union? Have they a definite code of discipline? It is scandalous that they should have opened fire at Bombay in the manner described by S. M. Joshi. Bombay Government must own full responsibility for the deeds of their home guards. They must not be allowed to develop like Hitler's S. S. Guards. Public opinion must assert itself and nip the evil in the bud.

I hope you would pass this resolution unanimously.

Rajkishore Samantrai (Utkal) : While endorsing fully the Kamath Committee Report I would like to make a few suggestions.

The Kamath Committee has recommended that a judicial enquiry should follow every firing. My suggestion is that only high court judges should be appointed to hold such enquiries because they alone have the ability to judge the various issues involved from all angles and have the necessary stature to withstand government pressure. I think the Report should be amended accordingly.

In paragraph 18, the Committee has discussed Section 144 Cr.P.C. only. But there are other sections which are detrimental to the interests of civil liberties and the Committee should have bestowed some thought on these also. Take Section 107, for instance. Though enacted by the British Government for use principally against goondas, the present government does not hesitate to often use it against opposition parties. Again, Section 145 Cr.P.C. is not worthy to be put on the Statute Book of a democratic country. I hope the Committee would give due consideration to these suggestions.

Shanti Patel (Bombay) : I have risen here to support the resolution and have to stress only one main point. Firing, whenever it takes place and under whatever circumstances, should without fail be followed by a judicial enquiry and the culprits, whether they are the police or the home guards, brought to book. The bureaucratic attitude of the Congress Governments has made the police more fearless than they were before and they resort to firing under the slightest pretext. I am glad to say that in spite of some differences on the question of the conduct of agitation against the S.R.C. Proposals in the Bombay Executive, on this question there was absolute unanimity. The Bombay City Executive passed a resolution demanding judicial enquiry into the firing.

Ramdhari Shastri (Uttar Pradesh) : I want to move some amendments. My first amendment is to delete the words *as far as possible* before the words *High Court Judge* and the rest of that sentence after it in para 8. I feel district judges cannot be expected to be independent and judicial enough under the circumstances obtaining today. Secondly, I would like that the words *if*

there is genuine apprehension of evidence being tampered with in para 9, be deleted. I further feel that at the time of enquiry the officials concerned should be transferred from the place of occurrence.

Rajendra Trivedi (Uttar Pradesh) : I second what Ramdhari Shastri has already said and would like to stress for the acceptance of the amendment. It is my honest conviction that officials concerned must be transferred. Otherwise, it would be difficult to arrive at correct conclusions.

I would also propose the deletion of Section 107. Reference to a particular section, 144 Cr.P.C. should be substituted by a more generalised statement.

Ramamurthy Naidu (Hyderabad) : Swords and guns cannot form a foundation for justice. Gandhiji stood for non-violence but the government that is being carried on in his name has no use for it. Is it not strange that those who shoot and those who are shot down, both swear by the name of Gandhi? Nehru has evolved the *Panch Shila*, a formula for co-existence, for international affairs. We are preaching peace and non-violence to the whole world but we do not hesitate to shoot innocent people at home. The mass satyagraha for the liberation of Goa was withdrawn in the name of non-violence. There our national self-respect was at stake. But innocent Indian patriots who wanted to demonstrate their anger at Portuguese atrocities peacefully were shot down by the Indian police. Is there any logic or consistency in these policies?

H. V. Kamath (Madhya Pradesh) : The Report of the Committee is before you. We have made certain recommendations. While speaking on this subject I am reminded of a remark made by Dr. Katju, former Home Minister, on the floor of the Parliament. The question of admission of women into the Indian Administrative Service was under discussion, and some members had opined that women would not be able to cope with the heavy responsibilities such service entailed. Replying to their arguments Dr. Katju had said : "Some people imagine that members of the I.A.S. have no duty but to go about ordering firing." And the same Dr. Katju on a subsequent occasion expressed his inability to supply the House with complete data on firings under the Congress Government since 1947. This was indirect admission of the fact that firings had taken place so often that Government found it difficult to give correct figures. Can there be a greater condemnation of the policies pursued by the Congress Government?

There is ordinarily no justification for firing on unarmed people in a genuine democracy. We should be consistent in our principles and stand by them not only when we are in the opposition but also when we happen to be in power.

I have, however, to make one point clear. While I stand for the principle of "No firing on unarmed masses", I can yet

concede that there may be circumstances under which firing may have to be resorted to. We have to distinguish between *force* and *firing*. Firing is the extreme end of force. Between the two there are various stages. We have mentioned these stages in our Report. In the first place, the authority to order fire should normally rest with a magistrate and not police officers. Magistrates should order fire only after exhausting all other methods of controlling the crowd and after having given due warning. Even then the first shots should be fired in the air. The next stage should be to fire at the lower part of the body. Regular firing may take place only when there is no other alternative, and when the police itself is attacked and there is imminent danger to life or when large-scale destruction of property is taking place.

Each and every firing must be followed by a regular judicial enquiry as a matter of course. Some persons are of the opinion that in case firing takes place on an unarmed crowd, the government must also resign. I do not share this view. I am afraid that if such a procedure were to be established as a regular practice, you will not be able to run the government for any length of time. We shall simply be playing into the hands of the Communists and other anti-national elements who may deliberately provoke police firing. I would therefore impress upon you the necessity of not falling a prey to this if you are really planning to form your own government.

I hope that you will adopt this Report unanimously. By throwing your whole weight behind it and by mobilising public opinion in its favour you will force the other parties also to come round and accept these proposals. It is a matter of pride for us that the Praja Socialist Party should be the first political party in India to take up this issue seriously and formulate concrete proposals in this regard.

Mahamaya Prasad Sinha (Bihar): I stand for the adoption of this resolution and the Report in full. Kamath has thrown light on the question in his own inimitable way. I am sure we shall stand by the principles enunciated here whenever and wherever we come into power in India. We shall not brook any violation of these principles and shall take to task anyone found guilty of their infringement.

I can foresee that the Congress would not accept the recommendations contained in this Report because their guiding principles are different. The way the Bihar Government and Jawaharlal Nehru behaved in connection with the firing on innocent students at Patna and other places in Bihar leaves me in no doubt about this. Nehru who preaches the gospel of peace and non-violence to the whole world does not forbid the use of bullets on his own unarmed people. I am not sure if even Hitler resorted to firing as many times as the Congress Governments have done in India. Power has gone to their heads. It has made them dizzy. The only way to bring them to their senses is to replace them in the seats of Government. And I do not hesitate to say that if

elections do not bring about the desired result we may have to fall back on the classical weapon of satyagraha forged by Gandhiji.

S. M. Joshi (Maharashtra): I am glad all the speakers have supported the resolution. The amendments can be divided into two parts: (1) amendments containing suggestions which are self-evident and need no discussion; and (2) amendments containing suggestions which need to be properly thrashed out before we can accept them. I personally think that the Chief Justice should have full authority to appoint any judge he considers fit for the task, be he a high court judge or district judge. I am sure we can trust our Chief Justices to appoint capable and independent judges for the purpose. The second type of amendments refer to sections other than 144 Cr.P.C. I do not think we should be in a hurry in such delicate matters. I am sure you will agree with me that the matter needs greater and more careful study. I hope these amendments would be withdrawn. In regard to the suggestion of transferring the concerned officers, again, I am not sure whether a transfer is possible every time. But the Report does make a provision for such a transfer in case there is genuine apprehension of the evidence being tampered with. Another suggestion proposes that the home guards may be specifically mentioned along with the police. But I do not think it is necessary because they are usually part of the police force.

Voting then took place on the amendments that were not withdrawn. The first amendment to delete the words *as far as possible* and *remove but we think that if the Chief Justice considers that a District Judge in the particular circumstances of the case is competent to hold an inquiry he may be appointed* in para 8 of the Report was passed by majority.

The other amendments when put to vote were lost by majority.

The Report as amended and the resolution recording appreciation of the services rendered by the Kamath Committee were then put to vote and passed unanimously (See Appendices C and D).

DISCUSSION ON POLICY STATEMENT

The Chairman then called upon Prof. Raja Ram Shastri to move the Policy Statement for the consideration of the House.

Prof. Raja Ram Shastri (Uttar Pradesh): While moving this Policy Statement, prepared by our Chairman, Acharya Narendra Deva, for your consideration and acceptance, I would, to begin with, refer to a few points raised by many in private and group discussions. I have heard the document being criticised from

opposite angles. One that it does not contain detailed programme. Second, that it is too long, that a short and concise statement would have been more apt. Both these criticisms in a way contradict each other. For, had it contained a detailed programme, it would have become longer still. But I will not go into these logical inconsistencies. I would only point out that it is a statement of policy, not a programme. Let us not confuse the two. A detailed programme will have to be drawn up soon. The General Elections are drawing near and we cannot escape drafting an election manifesto which will be our programme. So let us not get bogged down in these trivialities.

The Policy Statement bears the imprint of the evolution of socialist thought in India during the last eight years and more. Having come under Gandhiji's influence, leaders of Indian socialism evolved new trends and gave a distinctive look and flavour to Asian socialism. From Gandhiji we learned the value of democratic methods and of non-violence. Western social democracy, it is true, has also discarded violence. But after having discarded violence it substituted in its place parliamentary democracy. Following Gandhiji we have also discarded violence from our armoury. But, unlike western social democracy, we have not put absolute reliance on parliamentary democracy. Non-violence had been preached and talked about even before Gandhiji was born. But it was given to him alone to link it with the upsurge of the masses and thus forge it into an infallible political weapon. We have accepted parliamentary democracy. But, following Gandhiji, we have put our faith in Jan Shakti—in the will and the inherent strength of the masses. It was a new thing, a novel contribution. Indian Socialists are proud of it. Our Policy Statement bears testimony to it.

Decentralisation of economic and political power in the context of modern experience and Gandhiji's teachings is another contribution made by Indian socialists to modern socialist thought. Acharya Kripalani is one of its greatest exponents today. And the Policy Statement has abundantly drawn upon his writings contained in that challenging pamphlet *Where Are We Going?* That production is not an end in itself but a means to an end, that the needs of production have to be balanced with the need to preserve human values is a great truth and the Policy Statement is the richer for it.

Asoka Mehta, in his thought-provoking book on *Socialism and Peasantry* has analysed how economic development in both capitalist and communist countries has been achieved at the expense of the peasant. We cannot adopt this method. Our economic development will be carried out not at the expense of the peasant but through enriching him. The Policy Statement makes this very explicit.

Vinoba and Jayaprakash Narayan have recently been evolving a new and far-reaching technique of non-violent social change. They have been successful in creating a new atmosphere and a growing climate of public opinion against attachment to property.

Bhoodan has achieved some spectacular results that have confounded its worst critics. It has vast potentialities. Its importance as a powerful aid to social change and quickening its process cannot be exaggerated. The Policy Statement has therefore very rightly given its full support to the movement and accepted all its practical implications. Only yesterday Jayaprakash Narayan talked about the necessity of accepting a programme of agrarian socialism. Much of it has already found its place in our Policy Statement. Its detailed application and acceptance can be taken up when we draw up our programme or the election manifesto.

In the Draft Policy Statement an effort has been made to synthesise all these ideas. May be there are other ideas which have not yet found a place in it. But that has been because some of these ideas have yet to be properly analysed, thrashed out and digested. The adoption of this Policy Statement will not, and cannot, bar the way to further progress. This Policy Statement does not and cannot claim to be the last word on socialist thought. It leaves the door open for further progress and evolution. Only, let us first be convinced of the rationality and intellectual validity of these new ideas. Who wants to stagnate and become a fossil in the end? New trends are bound to arise. But they cannot be accepted before they are mature enough for the purpose.

In our anxiety for progress and new ideas, however, let us not discard all that is old. All these new ideas have not disproved the fundamental soundness of the old, recognised pattern of socialism. What we are aiming at is a synthesis of the old basic concepts and the new ideas, not a wholesale substitution of the older basic concepts by entirely new conceptions. Should we, for instance, discard the concepts of democracy and equality simply because they have now become hoary with age?

Let us now take up the question of class struggle. That there are classes in society and there is conflict between them, no one denies today. Even those sociologists who are not socialists accept the idea. A new phrase "the class situation" has come to be used these days. But the idea is the same. "Class situation" gives rise to "patterns of behaviour" and is the root of social injustice. Jayaprakash Narayan yesterday pointed to the root cause of this injustice—individual ownership, which creates classes and class situations. The owning class very naturally fights to maintain intact its property. Thus there is conflict, struggle between the classes, between the class that exploits and the class that is exploited. Will the abolition of landlordism lead to an abolition of the classes in rural areas? Not necessarily. In my State of Uttar Pradesh the old landlords still exist with all the difference in wealth and status. And if we go over to collective farming a new form of class conflict may arise, as Jayaprakash has pointed out. A new managerial class may be born.

As long as the classes remain in society, class struggle will also remain. It cannot be discarded. Class struggle cannot be avoided, although one may attempt to evolve new patterns of this struggle. If the struggle between classes is there,

with which class will a socialist side? Whom will he support? For whom will he fight? Evidently for the exploited. And against whom will he fight? Evidently against the exploiters.

Class struggle, however, is not an end in itself. It is a means to an end : the end of a classless society. Let us not forget that socialism cannot be equated with class struggle. Class struggle alone cannot lead us to socialism either. Class struggle has, in the past led to feudalism after slavery and to capitalism after feudalism. It has therefore to be impregnated with the basic values of equality and democracy. Acharya Narendra Deva has enriched and purified the concept in this Policy Statement. Violent class struggle has been discarded, discarded for good, thrown on the dust heap, never to be picked up again. I am sure the concept of class struggle has been enriched and purified by its synthesis with non-violence.

Yet further enrichment and purification of the idea may still be possible. We do not deny that. We are proud of our leaders who are engaged in still further refining the socialist concepts and ideals. The process cannot stop.

Acharya Narendra Deva has laboured hard, in spite of his very serious illness, to prepare this Statement. He undertook this job at risk to his life, only because he felt that a clear-cut Policy Statement would go a long way in removing the confusion that prevailed among Party ranks. I am sure it meets the requirements of the situation. It gives an ideological basis to our Party. As such a basis it has to be discussed and adopted here. Do not bother yourself about minor adjustments and verbal changes. We can leave that to Acharya Narendra Deva. Do make your suggestions. Discuss it at your best. But adopt it as an ideological basis of the Party.

Ajit Roy (West Bengal) : I am happy to second this Policy Statement as presented to us. Along with other Party comrades I have been feeling the necessity of a Policy Statement. The Allahabad document was not a statement of policy as such but a governmental programme. The problem before us today, however, is not so much as to what we will do when we come into power but to build up a socialist movement on secure foundations. I prefer to look upon myself not as one of those who would reap the harvest of the work which has been accomplished but as a pioneer of the mighty socialist movement which has yet to be built. Our main task today is to complete the elementary work of building up a mass party of socialism. We have therefore to think of the thousands and thousands of young men and women whom we would draw into the Party orbit. For them, if not for anything else, we need an ideology, a definite understanding of the tasks ahead, an intellectual conviction that will not only help them to grapple with the difficult problems facing us but also to sustain their enthusiasm and the will to suffer and to sacrifice for the cause of socialism. Our Party will not be able to grow without a basic ideological unity among the ranks. Without it, it will break into

pieces at the first touch of a political crisis in the country. This Policy Statement meets that need and will provide the basis for the future development of our Party.

There is little to be said over and above what Prof. Raja Ram Shastri has already said. As I look at it, two main ideas emerge out of the statement : (1) class struggle, and (2) the role as an opposition party in the immediate future. We can develop the Party only as a party of struggle, of class struggle, of the struggle of the exploited against their exploitation and an inequitous social order. Our aim is to put an end to class struggle by establishing a classless society. But today the class struggle is there. It is going on every day. People with money and power are utilising their resources to oppress people. The Praja Socialist Party cannot stand aside in this conflict. It must throw its lot with the exploited and the oppressed. Moral appeals cannot stop this exploitation or this struggle. Nor can moral appeals change our social structure. History does not provide us with a single instance of this nature. The people have to struggle for a social change. We cannot afford to disregard the teachings of history. I do not believe that we can create a classless society without class struggle. But, at the same time, we must understand that we carry on the struggle to create socialist consciousness among the toiling masses, not only for their narrow and day-to-day demands and grievances.

The second point is about the P.S.P. performing the role of an opposition party. I do not think anyone in this conference seriously believes that we can form a socialist government after the next general elections. I hope everybody recognises the fact that our prestige has gone down during the last few years. We shall have to work hard to regain our lost strength and prestige. We can develop and grow only as an opposition party under the existing circumstances. Our greatest political need today is to make our character transparent—our character of a determined opposition party.

I do not think it is necessary for me to explain the many new contributions made by this document to the theory and practice of socialism. Prof. Raja Ram Shastri has already done that. I would stress only one point. We cannot afford to shut our minds to new ideas. We live in a continuously changing world and have to analyse every new situation in national and international affairs in a realistic and progressive manner. We cannot afford to cling tenaciously to the old patterns of socialist thought and action. Our ideology must evolve along with an evolving society.

With these words I strongly commend the Policy Statement to you for acceptance. I am confident that it will go a long way in developing a new unity of outlook and purpose within the Party. It will help us tremendously in fighting confusion and enable us to march ahead with self-confidence and determination.

Acharya Kripalani (Uttar Pradesh) : I did not want to take part in the discussion on the Policy Statement. But my

friends and colleagues insisted that I should give my opinion and I could not refuse them.

I did not want to speak because I felt that I could not do justice to a document of about hundred pages in the short time at my disposal here. I would need to write at least 60 to 70 pages in order to properly discuss a document of this length and importance. I do not believe you will have the patience to listen to me at that length.

A Policy Statement is always intended to be a relatively permanent thing. It is there for a number of years. We should therefore not be in a hurry to adopt it here and now. We adopted a hurriedly drafted Policy Statement at Allahabad. But we had to go beyond it within a few months of its adoption. The Allahabad Policy Statement did not envisage the situation that arose in Travancore-Cochin. There was no provision or formula for a minority government in that Statement. But we could not wait for the policy to be amended. That would have taken a year. We had to act, and we did. We formed the ministry in spite of our Policy Statement which threw no light on the situation that faced us then. Let us not forget that mistake. Let us learn from experience. Let us not be in a hurry.

This document needs serious discussion. Let us not shirk it. I do not shirk it. You can discuss it here as long as your hosts are willing to feed you and tolerate you and that would not be for long. Also, personally I feel that we should not adopt it without its being discussed in the Party units first. Let us discuss it thoroughly before we adopt it. We can postpone its adoption by a few months. Heavens will not fall in the meantime.

I am prepared to discuss it with you here and now. But that will take a long time. Moreover, I would like to discuss it in the presence of its author, Acharya Narendra Deva. There are a number of points in it that need to be clarified. I would like to ask him many questions. It is only after that that I can formulate any constructive suggestions that I might have to make. All this cannot be done here today. I do not think that adoption of this Policy Statement in such a hurry would lead us anywhere. It will lead us to unnecessary and useless controversy. I would therefore plead with you to postpone its adoption by a few months.

There is, for instance, the issue of class struggle. I cannot subscribe to the view that class struggle has to be carried to every village. That will lead to the disruption of the country. Not long ago we had recommended that our villages should not be made scenes of partisan struggles for power, that elections to village panchayats should not be contested on party lines. How do we square this with the Policy Statement that has now been placed before us ?

Politics for me is a practical game. It is not a question of theory. It is not a science like, for instance, mathematics and physics where we have set formulae. Politics is essentially pragmatic. Innumerable forces are at work in a country. New

and unimaginable situations may rise at every step in our political life. No theory will be able to account for all that happens in the political and social life of a country. I have always refused to be bound down by abstract theories. No theory has ever kept me bound to it when the practical situation demands action in a particular direction. I took to Gandhiji not because I was convinced of his theories to begin with, but because he was a practical man. He had the necessary dynamism and adjustability. He was a No-changer and had opposed council entry in the early twenties. And yet it was under his guidance that the Congress accepted office under the 1937 constitution. He was a practical man and could see the essential difference between theory and the demand of a particular situation.

My advice to you is to be practical. Judge for yourself. Do not be led away by my views or those of the author of this document. Think for yourself and think in practical terms. Let us learn from our past experience and not commit the same mistakes again and again. Let us not adopt this Policy Statement without adequate discussion.

Purshottam Trikamdas (Bombay City) : I have come before you to oppose the adoption of the Policy Statement. There are definite reasons for my opposition.

It is not substantially different from the document placed before the National Executive at Lucknow. I had expressed my views at that time through a letter addressed to the Chairman. As no substantial changes have been made in the document since then my views also remain substantially the same.

It is my considered opinion that the title *Policy Statement* as applied to this document is a misnomer. It is, strictly speaking, not a Policy Statement but a statement of objectives. The two, I believe, are fundamentally different.

Socialism is a living faith, not a dogma. It can be achieved only by a process of trial and error. It cannot be something given once for all. It has, on the other hand, to undergo continuous change and evolution. If this document is presented to us as a final picture of our objectives, I would only say "Please save me from this dogma." I am not opposed to my friend Narendra Deva or Kripalani or Jayaprakash Narayan or Asoka Mehta writing books on the subject and placing them before the public for discussion. What I am opposed to is the adoption of a *Gita* or a *Bible* for the Praja Socialist Party, or, as a matter of fact, for any Socialist Party. So far as the objectives are concerned, we have already got a fairly general picture of what we want. Many of us have been thinking about the problems involved and the objectives are becoming clearer as a result of the discussions we are having. Maybe, if this discussion is continued unhampered for a decade or two, or even more, we should be able to achieve a fuller and more realistic picture of our objectives. I therefore do not want to shut out discussion at any stage, more so today when many of our ideas are still nebulous. The difficulty with documents of this

nature is that once they are adopted they tend to develop into a Bible thus hampering free and unbiased discussions. Any departure from them not only becomes difficult but also a source of strife and disruption in the Party. This has been our experience with the Allahabad Statement. Let us not repeat the mistake.

Let me make myself clear. I have no objection to the adoption of a Policy Statement. My only contention is that policy is quite different from objectives. Policy has to be adopted for a short period. Objectives have a relatively permanent value and place. A Policy Statement should state our attitude to the most important burning questions of the day. In the international sphere, for instance, we have to decide whether we have to be neutrals, and, if so, what kind of neutrality will be of benefit to us. SEATO and Baghdad Pact, Arab-Israeli conflict in West Asia, Goa and Kashmir are only some of the urgent international problems facing us today. Internally, we have to come to grips with the problems of the reorganisation of States and the Second Five Year Plan being finalised by the Government. This Policy Statement contains generalities more than anything else. I do not think generalities can be given the name and status of a Policy Statement. If this is to be our policy, I can only say that the Party has no policy at all.

We are passing through a crisis. Valuable comrades have left us. The Congress has become a monolithic organisation. The people yearn for an effective opposition. But they will not repose their confidence in a party that is ever engaged in a theoretical discussion of objectives. They want their practical day-to-day problems to be tackled and solved. In the long run that party alone will command their confidence which proves its willingness and ability to tackle practical problems. Let us not therefore degenerate into a discussion group. I am sure you want to be a political party, capable of replacing the present ruling party. I am sure you want to have political power with the object of initiating policies that would lay the foundation of a genuine democratic socialist society. But I hope you realise that you can do it only by coming down to earth and formulating practical policies, not theoretical policies.

Moreover, such documents should never be adopted in undue haste. We acquire time to think out properly all the implications involved in the formulations. I do not think we should rush through such an important document. There will be many delegates here who may not have even carefully gone through the whole document. Why should we adopt a document which many amongst us have not yet adequately understood or grasped? Why this hurry? Have you, for instance, clearly understood all the implications of the formulations in the last para of the chapter *Transition to Socialism*? Is it necessary to state all this in a Policy Statement? Has any political party ever done it? A political party has to deal with the situations as they arise. It cannot bind its hands once for all. Situations can arise which no one can visualise today. It happened in the case of Allahabad

Statement which had tried to provide for all conceivable situations. Did we not have to violate it and form a minority government in Travancore-Cochin in spite of it? Let us learn something from our *experience*. Let us not bind ourselves in such a manner that we are rendered incapable of meeting new situations.

In the end, let me make my position clear again. I am not opposed to a Policy Statement. All that I want is that the document must really be what it professes to be.

S. M. Joshi (Maharashtra) : I do not agree with the views expressed by Acharya Kripalani and Purshottam Trikamdas. I had come to Gaya with the impression that the Draft Policy Statement had reached every provincial office about one month before the conference was due to be held. The Central Office, I understand, had given advance copies of it to all provincial offices with a request to convene meetings of Provincial Executive Committees in the first week of December to discuss the Statement and forward their reactions and suggestions for the consideration of the National Executive that was to meet at Lucknow in the second week of December. I know that many Provincial Executives did discuss the document. We in Maharashtra discussed it in our Provincial Conference. The National Executive that met at Lucknow subsequently had the benefit of the views sent to them by a number of Provincial Executives and invitees to the National Executive. The National Executive had the benefit of the views of Jayaprakash Narayan also who had attended the Lucknow meeting for a day. After having discussed it thoroughly for two days the Executive decided to make a number of suggestions to the author, who accepted practically all of them. During the whole of this period no one suggested that we should not adopt this Policy Statement in this conference and that it needs to be discussed by the Party units and branches for a couple of months more. Had we been advised thus we might have agreed to postpone the conference by a couple of months. But now that the delegates have assembled here from all parts of the country I do not think it would be proper to postpone its adoption. It will make confusion worse confounded and sow the seeds of further disruption in the Party? I am therefore strongly of the opinion that we should adopt it here. If need be we can extend the conference by a day or two. I am sure our hosts would be willing to tolerate us that long.

I do not understand why we should treat the Policy Statement like the Koran or the Gita. It is based on the current politico-economic situation in the country and I don't find anything in it that may be detrimental to the interests of the Party. If the situation demands it, it can be altered and amended at any time and as many times as necessary. It does not impose any fetter upon us. Nor do I think that the Allahabad Statement had served as a chain on our development. We treated that as a base and continue to do so. Chains, I would submit, are not forged by theses, but by differences among Party leaders. It was not the Allahabad thesis that led to disruption in our ranks. It was the

differences among our leaders that have been responsible for this unfortunate development.

We will not be able to face the public and the Party workers without a definite Policy Statement. Jayaprakash Narayan told us yesterday that he did not want to remain even an ordinary member of the Party. But we cannot sit idle. We will take whatever inspiration we can from our leaders and then march ahead with confidence in our strength and purpose. We must adopt this Policy Statement here before we disperse. If necessary we can postpone discussion on the resolutions—they are not as important—and concentrate on the Policy Statement. Even Jayaprakash Narayan told us at Lucknow that we could manage with this Policy Statement for the present and that changes, even though of a basic nature, could be made after a year or two if necessary. I do not believe the conference would agree to postpone its adoption.

I do not believe in class struggle. But I do believe in the existence of class struggle. This document contains a statement on some of the fundamental points of our policy and ideology. Will the coming three or four months make a change in these fundamentals? Fundamentals will remain fundamentals even six months after. So why not decide the issue here and now? Why postpone it? Postponement will only result in unnecessary bickering and heart-burning. We must adopt the Policy Statement here.

The Conference then adjourned.

WEDNESDAY—DECEMBER 28, 1955

AFTERNOON—DELEGATES SESSION

The Conference reassembled at 3 p.m.

DISCUSSION ON POLICY STATEMENT Contd.

K. K. Bhattacharya (Uttar Pradesh): I have no doubt that the document is of vital significance and will go down in the history of the Party as a great milestone in its progress. The Allahabad Policy Statement bears no comparison with it. It is the task of Party members now to spread its message far and wide. I do not agree with Acharya Kripalani that its adoption should be postponed. Let us make up our mind here and now. After having gone through it carefully during the last three weeks I have come to the conclusion that socialists all over the world would hail it as a great piece of socialist thinking. We must adopt it here. If necessary we can extend the session by a day or two.

The Congress Government, today, is acting and behaving like Louis XIV of France who, in his vanity, had declared : "What is the State. I am the State." We have to take up this challenge and show the Congress its place. This Policy Statement will be a source of great strength to us. In the struggle between the haves and the have-nots this document calls upon us to take cudgels on behalf of the have-nots. It is a Magna Carta of the have-nots. Let us go to the people with it and pave the way with our toil and sweat for a new social order in which the distinction between the privileged and the oppressed will have vanished for ever.

B. C. Verghese (Travancore-Cochin) : I rise to plead for a cause which I know would not be to the taste of many a delegate. The Policy Statement is a very long document and it takes time to understand, appreciate and digest it. We should be grateful to the National Executive for having presented it to us. We needed a Policy Statement badly. But why did we need it? We needed it to activate our workers down to the lowest level. Before we seek anyone's co-operation we should be able to convince the ordinary member of our stand, and our policy and programme. A policy statement is meant to facilitate this task. But if this Policy Statement is to fulfil this task in an adequate manner, we should make it possible for the ordinary members to digest it and also to place his suggestions and reactions before us. Let them have a feeling that their views are being given proper and due consideration.

I believe that a policy statement should deal with the basic fundamentals of our ideology and not with current affairs alone, as has been pleaded by Purshottam Trikamdas. But we should also know what we are saying and voting upon. I am afraid most of us have not yet properly digested it. Party units should be consulted and their opinions sought. Party units may not be able to give us much that can really guide us. But it would still be important to have their suggestions. I would even propose that the National Executive should undertake to draft a Policy Statement on the basis of suggestions received from Party units. Please do not misunderstand me. I do not mean to suggest that this document is not satisfactory. All that I want to say is that such an important document should not be hurried through. Why should we do it? We have no need to. We have a Policy Statement adopted at Allahabad. I know it suffers from many shortcomings. But it can continue to serve us for some time more. I do not understand why Lohia should haunt us at this Conference. Forget him. We have done with him. Let us not be worried about what he will say if we do not adopt the Policy Statement here. It is important that we do not lay ourselves open to the charge of hurrying through such a basic document. I do not understand quite a few things in it. For instance, turn to the last para in the chapter *Transition to Socialism*. I do not know why a Policy Statement should contain such definite

and precise instructions. Why should we grudge the support of another party in forming a government? How long can a minority government stand single-handed? Our support may be sought by other parties in forming a government. A member of the National Executive told me that it would be for the National Executive to come forward with the idea of forming a government even if we are not the largest single party in the legislature. But the Policy Statement contradicts this view. It seems to me as if even members of the National Executive have not fully grasped the various implications of the Policy Statement. Then why should we be asked to adopt it in such a hurry. At the back of the minds of delegates who are pressing for its immediate adoption seems to lie a fear that some unknown evil might befall the Party, that there may be fresh disruption in the Party, if this Policy Statement is not accepted here. I do not entertain any such fears, even if some members of the National Executive are thus afraid. It is for the delegates, and not for the National Executive alone, to adopt this Policy Statement. Why should we blindly follow the Executive? The delegates should be fearless and determined. They should come forward and, if necessary, redraft the Statement. Let us have the guts to tell our leaders that we shall not be goaded into following any one blindly. Tell Acharya Narendra Deva, tell Asoka Mehta, tell Jayaprakash Narayan and tell Acharya Kripalani frankly that you will think about ideological and other problems with an independent and uninhibited mind. It is rather surprising that we should commit ourselves to a policy of neither forming a government by ourselves nor help anyone else to form a government. What shall we tell the people about the message of Gaya? We shall make ourselves the laughing-stock of the world. Let us pause and think dispassionately before we cast our votes on such an important issue. Once again I beg you not to adopt the document here. Let me also sound a note of warning. If this document is adopted here by force of majority it would create more confusion than it seeks to liquidate. If we pass it in a hurry, we shall have to repent of it at leisure.

V. S. Dandekar (Madhya Pradesh): If you look at it closely, this Policy Statement can be divided into four parts. First, the Socialist Movement, its objects and its picture. Let us not forget that ours is not only a political party, one of the many political parties in the country, an opposition party, but also a movement. The Congress Socialist Party started in 1934 as a movement. This is the document of a movement. From Meerut to Kanpur we have been passing theses. They represent the different phases of our Party. We have laboured hard and carved out a party, a vital party. We are alive and kicking today in spite of so many desertions. Why is it so? Because we feel we have a mission to fulfil. This document reiterates that mission and reinforces it powerfully.

It is secondly, a programme. 70 out of its 100 pages are devoted to socialism as a movement and a mission. A few pages

Statement and not a programme.

Thirdly, it deals with organisation.

The fourth part consists of tactics and can be suitably altered later on, if found necessary. It does not constitute the foundation of the document. I agree with Purshottam Trikamdas that we should leave issues of strategy to the National Executive. As regards the last para in the chapter *Transition to Socialism*, we can make suitable amendments to it in this Conference. Nothing prevents us from doing that. I do not understand the plea to postpone adoption of the whole document. It does not stand or fall by that particular paragraph, which can be amended here.

This document is not being adopted for a lifetime. It can be amended at any time by a similar or even a Special Conference. I have tried to understand the plea put forward by B. C. Verghese but I am sorry to say that I have not been able to appreciate it. Why should we not adopt it here? Why should we create a situation which perpetuates confusion and works for further desertions? I do not understand why such a situation should arise at all. May I point out, without any offence to any one, that most of the stalwarts who founded the Congress Socialist Party in 1934 are no more with us. Acharya Narendra Deva, with a few other notable exceptions, remains with us. But the Party has not died because of it. During the last twentyone years of its existence it has been gaining momentum and making continuous progress. Those who have gone felt like Lohia that they were above the Party. I am therefore glad that he is gone. Others who feel like that may also go. But where can we go? Where can the workers go—the workers who have nourished this Party with their lifeblood? We will not leave the Party under any circumstances, whether the old leaders continue to be with us at the helm or not.

The decision to draft a Policy Statement was taken in July at Jaipur. It was there that Acharya Narendra Deva was requested by the National Executive to undertake this heavy responsibility. He has been continuously in bed since that time. I thought it was the duty of our leading members to go to him and assist him in the task. It does not behove us now at this stage to press for its postponement. Now that all of us have gathered here from the four corners of India we should discuss it and adopt it here. Acharya Narendra Deva, it is true, is not here to guide us today. But that should not prevent us from going ahead. At this Conference, we, the delegates, have been called upon to shoulder the responsibility. Shall we fail in it?

Peter Alvares (Bombay City): I have come here to support the basic fundamentals of the Policy Statement. It is my considered opinion that the Statement should be adopted here.

If we do not do it here I am afraid we shall throw the gates wide open for further confusion and disintegration.

B. C. Verghese agrees with the fundamentals of the Statement. And yet, strangely enough, he wants to postpone its adoption. I do not understand it. Rather too much stress has been laid on the last paragraph of the chapter *Transition to Socialism*. I, for one, do not take such a gloomy view. The National Executive, on the other hand, has very correctly changed certain provisions of the Allahabad Statement in this regard. It is only correct that we should take power when we have a majority. And if there is not majority we should think over the problem and go ahead only if circumstances warrant it. We should not go in for coalitions and pledge our support to other parties before there is an occasion for it.

I would like to refute Purshottam Trikamdas's allegation that the Policy Statement is doctrinaire in its approach. I have read it very carefully more than once and I sincerely feel that it is not doctrinaire. Blended as it is with principles of non-violence, it would have been acceptable even to Gandhiji. Class conflict finds its due place in it. But I hope everybody would appreciate that, as visualised and presented here, it is based on principles of non-violence. It is not a question of believing in or promoting class conflict, but of eradicating it and finding suitable ways for doing it. Class struggle has been identified with satyagraha and peaceful strikes and as such it should not perturb anyone. Moreover, means and ends have been clearly defined in the Statement. We have here not only the general aims defined clearly but also the means. With us means first elevate our aims, then assume a revolutionary propose. I do not believe that anyone can accuse us of subordinating our means to the end of capturing power. We have our constructive and other programmes and we propose to go ahead with them, not waiting for the day when we shall be in power.

I strongly plead that the Policy Statement should be adopted here in this Conference.

Kamal Dev Sharma (Bombay City): Many views have been placed before us. Some of our leaders are for rejecting the Statement outright. Some have pleaded for its acceptance in this Conference. Some others are in favour of postponing its adoption. I personally feel that there are a few things in this Statement which need further clarification. Various passages in the document make it clear that, according to it, supreme power in the Party rests with the ordinary members of the Party. I have only one question to ask. Are we not violating this principle by seeking to adopt it here without referring it to the Party units? We have not given any opportunity to the ordinary member to express his opinion on it before taking it up in the Conference for final adoption. It should have been circulated to all Party units, for eliciting their views, at least one month before the Conference was due to meet. This was never done. We shall now be forced to give our opinion here without consulting our units. This

is neither fair nor proper. I would therefore urge on you the desirability of referring the Statement to the Party units before its final adoption.

Sarangdhar Das (Utkal): It is our misfortune that Acharya Narendra Deva is not present here. I would, however, recall that representatives of different provincial branches of the Party made their suggestions at Jaipur Camp. This Policy Statement has been drafted on the basis of those suggestions. Again, it was sent to all provincial branches about a month ago. Some of the Provincial Executives even sent their reactions to the National Executive which met at Lucknow in the second week of December to consider it. I am therefore surprised to find some of the delegates pressing for its postponement. Let us not forget that we have suffered disruption only recently. It has been a great disturbing factor. The issues of coalition and co-operation with the party in power during the last three years have been generating confusion among Party ranks. It cannot be allowed to go on further. We must have a clear statement of principles to revive our faith and revitalise our organisation. Without it we are doomed.

Some of the delegates have opposed the idea of class struggle. Unfortunately, I do not agree with them. I regard class struggle as essential. I am not a lawyer. Nor am I a leader with any refined intellectual background. But I have had a little experience of practical life in far off lands like the United States of America. And my experience teaches me that there cannot be any improvement in the living standards of the working masses without a sustained class struggle. Bhoodan and Sarvodaya have great and noble principles. Bhoodan has been able to create some impression. But let us not forget its limitations. Take Utkal, for example. Sardar Patel integrated the territories of 26 small States within Utkal. The Princes of these 26 States distributed vast areas of land among their wives and brothers as soon as they got wind of what lay in store for them. They have now donated a few thousand acres of this land to the Bhoodan movement. But they continue to be in possession of extensive tracts of land and exploit poor tenants and farm labourers ruthlessly. Bhoodan has not been able to do away with this exploitation. It cannot do it. We have to face this fact. Class struggle is the only instrument with the aid of which we can hope to end exploitation. We can take to the Bhoodan movement. But then we will have to wind up this Party. We can co-operate with the Congress Government in implementing the Second Five Year Plan. But then, again, we will have to wind up this Party. Are we prepared to do it?

I earnestly plead for the adoption of this Policy Statement here and now. We can, by all means, amend it here. No one prevents you from doing that. But let us not hesitate. Let us not postpone its adoption.

Our opponents criticise us for speaking in different voices.

They are perhaps right. Not only the people at large but our own seasoned workers get confused when our topmost members speak differently. Let us remove this confusion. Let us adopt this document as an authentic document of our policy. Its adoption will remove all misunderstandings and revitalise the faith of our ordinary workers. It will inspire them to go to the villages, study and appreciate their problems, try to find correct solutions of these problems and march ahead with some confidence to the cherished goal of a casteless and classless society.

Munshi Ahmed Din (Punjab): I would have been happy to agree with the majority here. But, unfortunately, I do not find myself in that happy position.

I do not want to press you for postponing its adoption. The majority of the delegates assembled seem to be in favour of adopting it here. I do not want to come in your way. The decision lies with you. Pass it by all means if you consider it so very essential. But let us give a patient hearing to all speakers and keep an open mind on the various questions involved. Let us have determination; but, then, let us also have the capacity to change our views if some argument convinces us.

Our Party has been working for democratic socialism ever since 1947, when we first inscribed it on our banner. It has been stated here that capitalism is fast decaying and that its place is being taken by totalitarian communism. That was never our view. We have always believed that capitalism would finally be replaced by democratic socialism and not by communism. When I joined the Party about twenty years ago I was a typical communist. Since then I have radically changed. But I now find that while the Chairman of the Reception Committee talked in terms of Sarvodaya, the Chairman's Address, in spite of its critical appreciation, had sympathy for Soviet Russia and China. I wish Acharya Narendra Deva could have been here as he might have thrown light on it. All of us feel grateful to him for having agreed at Nagpur to shoulder this heavy responsibility in spite of his failing health and thus saved the Party from disintegration. But I would neither be true to him nor to myself if I suppress my honest views out of regard for him.

I do not think it is possible to adjust Gandhism and Marxism in any fundamental way. Nor is there any adjustment possible between totalitarian communism and democratic socialism. The two are distinct and their fundamental opposition to each other should be made really explicit. The system obtaining in Soviet Russia has nothing in common with the system of democratic socialism that the PSP would like to see established in India.

The National Executive has taken a bold step in presenting this Statement to the Conference. Only if Jayaprakash Narayan and others had been bold and determined enough at Betul, the whole situation would have been different.

The Policy Statement refers to INTUC unions as "company

unions". I agree with this characterisation. But why are we silent about AITUC? Why do we not characterise it also? What is our attitude to it? We must clarify it if we do not want to invite further confusion in the labour movement.

Again, the document is silent about the foreign policy of the Government of India. They talk of neutrality, non-alignment and non-violence. But today we find Nehru a bit more inclined towards the communist camp. We should not be silent about it.

On Kashmir, again, the Statement is silent. Today there are no civil liberties in Kashmir. Other parties are being suppressed. Peace brigade goondas are harassing all opponents. And yet we are silent about Kashmir.

In the end I would refer to the banning of all electoral adjustments with the Congress, the Communists and communalist parties? I would humbly submit that it is a question of tactics and we should give the National Executive freedom in this respect.

Sibnath Banerji (West Bengal) : I do not understand why members of the National Executive come here to oppose the adoption of this Policy Statement. They have had full opportunity to discuss it. It is the ordinary delegates and Party members who had no such opportunity. I must say that the National Executive has failed in its duty. This document should first have been circulated to all Party branches, debated there and then brought before this Conference for adoption. On the contrary, what really happened was that Provincial Executive Committees received this document only about a month ago with strict instructions not to divulge its contents to others. Naturally therefore ordinary Party members did not have even a look at it. This is not the way of a democratic party.

I am however not opposed to its adoption here. I agree with its main fundamentals, although I have my differences on some points of detail. In spite of these differences I am not for its postponement. Let us act courageously and adopt it here.

Again it has been argued that it will become another Gita or Bible. As far as I know both Gita and the Bible have had different interpretations. Why should we be afraid of it? I do not see any reason why we should not adopt fundamental principles of our ideology. If necessary, we can amend it at a later stage. We are pragmatic. We have yet to formulate our election manifesto. At that time we can take into account any practical considerations advanced here.

I am not afraid of an alliance with the Communists if occasion demands it. It is a question of practical strategy and we should not bind our hands in this fashion.

I agree with Munshi Ahmed Din on the question of the Government of India's foreign policy. I also feel that Nehru's policy is veering round in favour of the communist bloc and we should warn the nation against it.

Harihar Bahinipati (Utkal): In the absence of any Policy Statement we will not be anywhere. We will not know our goal, our aim. We will have no unifying element within our Party. Purshottam Trikamdas said we should not have this new Koran or Gita. But how can we forge a socialist society when we have no thesis before us? We must have a clear policy, a clear perspective. Whatever disruption or disintegration we have had in this Party has been the result of a lack of a clear-cut policy. Now that delegates in such large numbers have assembled here from all over India it becomes incumbent on us to chalk out a definite line of action based upon a concrete ideology. If this thesis is accepted here comrades will go back with inspiration and renewed vigour.

It has been said that class struggle is the monopoly of Communists. It is not true. As a matter of fact their monopoly is insurrection and violence whereas we have pledged ourselves to non-violence.

The crisis in the Party is the crisis of leadership. There is no crisis in the rank and file. Leaders issue mutually contradictory statements and that causes confusion among the ordinary workers. The need of the hour is that the Party has one soul. This thesis will provide us with one. I am strongly of the opinion that this is an historic occasion and that we must adopt this document here.

Satyanarayan Rao (Andhra): I want to stress one point. We have had various Policy Statements. It appears to me that we are spending more and more time on a discussion of theories. Our aim, of course, is socialism. But what is the fun in talking about theories only? At Betul we discussed "compulsions of backward economy" and at Allahabad "equidistance". Where is it all leading us to? Congress treats us with contempt and Communists continually attack us. Our position in Andhra is very bad. My humble suggestion is that we should oppose the Congress. Then alone will the PSP be effective. Delegates should be free to make their choice. I am therefore of the opinion that we may discuss this document here but not adopt it today.

Ramanand Tiwari (Bihar): The Policy Statement is being discussed. I have heard speeches both for and against. But the essential point is that both in the public and among Party members there is a lot of confusion and misunderstanding about the PSP and its policy. We have now to decide our line of action firmly. Should we tolerate injustice and ejections silently? What should we do in the face of manifest injustice and oppression? Did not Gandhiji fight against injustice? Some of our friends want us to refer the Statement to Party units and ordinary members. But I would like to know whether at the time of the formation of the PSP, when the Socialist Party and the KMPP merged together, anyone cared to ascertain the opinion of Party units and ordinary members? I therefore fail to understand this clamour for consulting the ordinary member. Most of

our friends have come to the PSP for seeking justice and do in fact follow non-violence. We routed the British Government to secure justice and we would not hesitate to struggle against our national government for the sake of justice. What we want is justice and not struggle. We launch struggles only when we fail to secure justice.

This Policy Statement must be adopted here, otherwise confusion and apathy will increase. On the other hand, I feel confident that with the adoption of this Statement the Party will acquire sufficient strength to challenge everybody—the Congress, the Communists and Dr. Lohia.

Genda Singh (Uttar Pradesh): I beg to differ with Acharya Kripalani. I never expected that he would advise us to postpone the adoption of this Policy Statement at this stage. If he had felt like that he should have met Acharya Narendra Deva earlier and discussed the various issues involved. Something might have emerged out of it. It is not possible now to postpone it. Such a course, if adopted, would cost us very dearly, not only in money but also in Party solidarity and strength. It might lead to a further wave of desertions and disintegration. This National Conference is the sovereign body of the Party. Why should we leave things of such basic importance to be decided by the National Executive or the General Council? We have burnt our fingers many a time before and should not repeat the experiment.

Was it the old Purshottam Trikamdas speaking here today? I am afraid not. I am constrained to say that he diverted the entire discussion into a wrong channel. If he has any objection he could press for the deletion or amendment of the concerned passage or section. Why press for postponement of its adoption? We do not want to impose any fetters or handcuffs on the National Executive. The National Executive has been given discretion in times of emergency. But we should surely like the Party to be consulted if there is a question of joining a coalition in normal times.

We cannot shut our eyes to the struggle of the classes. It exists. We cannot shut out realities from our view. But we do not preach class hatred. Class struggle and class hatred are two different things. We believe in peaceful strikes and satyagraha. It should not scare anyone away.

Rajhans (Maharashtra): The Policy Statement must be adopted at this Conference. Acharya Kripalani is opposed to the concept of class struggle because he is afraid it will lead to violence in rural areas. But the class struggle is going on. Even Vinoba's movement is class struggle. In fact, any movement against injustice and exploitation is class struggle. And I believe that without such class struggle, democratic socialism will not emerge.

We must have an ideal. The Policy Statement provides us with one. I hope that in the coming general elections the Party

would not enter into any electoral alliances or adjustments. We must seek the vote directly for democratic socialism and prepare for the electoral battle on that basis.

This document gives a clear enunciation of socialist values. It answers at great length the question as to what would be the social and cultural relationships in a socialist society. Acharya Narendra Deva has done distinct service to socialist thought by focussing attention on these aspects.

We have to build a socialist movement in India. What would be its motive force? Class struggle alone can fulfil that role. Only class solidarity can lead to human solidarity.

Antoniswamy (Tamilnad): Speaking in Tamil, he said : We came here from far-away Tamilnad. We have failed yet to understand what we have gained by coming here at so much cost in time and money. We came here to understand the fundamentals of democratic socialism. But how can we do it when all the speeches are delivered either in English or Hindi, both of which we cannot follow? Even the Policy Statement has been published in English and Hindi alone. We could have followed it if the Central Office had provided us with a Tamil version. But now we do not know what to do or say. I would therefore request you to put off the discussion by at least three months so that we can have an opportunity of thoroughly understanding it.

Chandra Shekhar (Uttar Pradesh): Much has been said about the Policy Statement. Acharya Kripalani has pressed for postponing its adoption as he wants to seek clarification from Acharya Narendra Deva on many points. But I do not think it is necessary to postpone our decision. The Policy Statement has been presented to this Conference on behalf of the National Executive, which should be able to satisfy Acharya Kripalani on any points that he might have to raise. Nor do we need to circulate it to our units. It will not be of much use. We, the delegates, are the elected representatives of the ordinary members of the Party and are fully competent to take a decision.

The Party workers seem to have lost some of the confidence they used to have in the leaders. This is due to the conflicting statements made by the leaders during the past two years. Com. Verghese has remarked that the minds of some of the speakers are haunted by the ghost of Dr. Lohia. But it is not so. Our minds are quite clear. Certainly even today some of the leaders are obsessed with Lohia's way of thinking. It is the weakness with all the unprincipled politicians. They all emphasise programme to the detriment of principle.

We therefore want a definite policy and refuse to be silent spectators of this process of disintegration any longer. Everybody seems to be concerned about the ideologies of particular leaders, but nobody seems to be worried about the ideology of the worker. His mind is also troubled. Should we not do something to end his agony?

From the discussion itself it is perfectly clear that the document is generally acceptable. It is worth noting that even our great leaders like Acharya Kripalani and Purshottam Trikamdas while opposing it have not been able to refer to more than two or three points to which they have objection. We do not say "accept every word of it." Change it where you like. Press for your amendments. But do not defer its adoption. This is neither necessary nor desirable.

Munshi Ahmed Din was worried about some sympathetic reference to Russia and China. But may I point out that the Policy Statement contains no much reference and that the Chairman's Address, in which there might be some such reference, has not come up for discussion and adoption here?

This Policy Statement will end all confusion. I have no doubt in my mind that its adoption would not lead to any further disintegration of the Party. On the contrary, it might induce even those who have gone over to Lohia to come back. I hope this conference will adopt it here and now.

P. R. V. savda (Bombay City): I have no objection to the document as such. But I was surprised to find that the delegates hooted those who opposed it here. This is not the way to build up a democratic movement. We should have an open mind and listen patiently to all points of view. It is only after that that we can come to a correct estimate of the document before us. It was also surprising to find leaders like S. M. Joshi and V. S. Dandekar talking in terms of leaders and ordinary members. They seem to be very solicitous to the ordinary member. But this solicitude is not to be seen when the question of referring this document to the ordinary members is raised. Why should we not give an opportunity to the ordinary members of the Party to discuss it and debate it before the Party finally adopts it. Will it not be better, even for this document, if it comes from below and is not imposed from above?

Karpoori Thakur (Bihar): I am for adopting the Policy Statement here and now. We are pained to find old leaders like Purshottam Trikamdas and Munshi Ahmed Din opposed to it. Purshottam has been at one time the General Secretary of the Party. Was he ever of the view that the Party should have no Policy Statement or thesis? Did he or did he not believe in class struggle at that time? We all know what were his views then. Unfortunately he seems now to be opposed to all theses. But did he object to the Meerut and Faizpur theses of the old Congress Socialist Party? This is surely not the first thesis in the history of the Party. Again it has been said that the document makes no reference to Kashmir, Goa and S.R.C. Proposals. These, I would submit, are current problems. A Policy Statement is of a comparatively permanent value. These problems can be discussed in separate resolutions.

Munshi Ahmed Din has objected to the expression of sympathy for Russia and China. Sympathy is quite another thing but where did he find support for the Russian system and method? I can refer him to chapter XI of the Policy Statement wherein Acharya Narendra Deva has narrated in some detail the history of the Communist Party. He has recounted their acts and policies of disruption, terrorism and subversion. The document condemns Soviet nationalism, Pan Slavism and the Soviet urge to establish its dictatorship over the whole world through communist parties operating in different countries of the world. I do not believe anyone could have stated our attitude to the Soviet Union, totalitarian communism and the Communist Party of India more clearly or correctly.

The discussion makes it clear that no one has any objection to seven of the eleven chapters into which this document has been divided. All the discussion has been centred on the remaining four chapters. The delegates can make necessary amendments in these four chapters. Or suggestions and amendments can be referred to Acharya Narendra Deva and the National Executive. But there is no valid reason for postponing its adoption. I would suggest the addition of a twelfth chapter: Our Education Policy.

Acharya Kripalani has opposed class struggle. But I am sure he does it only academically. Did he not write a strong letter to Acharya Vinoba Bhave about ejectments of tenants by the landlords in the districts of Purnea and Saharsa in Bihar? Did he, again, not uphold the Pardi satyagraha led by Asoka Mehta and Ishwarlal Desai? I remember it well that when the editor of *Harijan* criticised this satyagraha, it was Acharya Kripalani who had refuted his arguments. I therefore really do not believe that he is against non-violent class struggle. As a party, we cannot give up fighting against injustice, oppression and tyranny. I appeal to the delegates to adopt the Policy Statement here at Gaya.

Jagannath Shastri (Uttar Pradesh): Maybe some of the leaders are not happy or satisfied with the presentation of the Policy Statement in the form in which it has been done. But we are happy, and so are our villagers. We have been sent here by the ordinary members, the primary members, not for passing resolutions on current affairs but primarily for the adoption of this Policy Statement. We have to take back with us a definite and concrete policy. We are here for that purpose. Any amendments, if necessary, can be made here by the delegates. We cannot postpone it.

The Conference then adjourned.

THURSDAY—DECEMBER 29, 1955

MORNING—DELEGATES SESSION

The Conference Assembled at 9 a.m.

RESOLUTION ON GOA

The Chairman called upon Peter Alvares to move the draft resolution on Goa on behalf of the Chair.

Peter Alvares (Bombay City): Moving the resolution he said: The movement for the liberation of Goa, Daman and Diu, small patches of Portuguese territories on Indian soil, is historic from many a viewpoint. It is a continuation of India's fight for freedom under Gandhiji's unique leadership with the weapons forged by him. It is a constant reminder to us that the mission bequeathed to us by the Father of the Nation has yet to be fulfilled because the freedom of India will not be complete without the liquidation of these last pockets of colonial rule.

The Praja Socialist Party has every reason to feel proud of its part in this struggle. The struggle, in fact, was launched under its auspices by Dr. Lohia as early as 1946. But the movement is much older. Goa has on record at least thirty struggles against colonial rule. It is, therefore, not our creation. It is an expression of the irrepressible urge of the people of Goa, Daman and Diu for national freedom, which has been coming up again and again after every suppression by means of brute force. But how long?

Although our Party has been connected with it intimately ever since its inception in 1946, we have never regarded it as a Party issue. On the other hand, we have always recognised it as a national issue and never tried to derive a narrow partisan benefit out of it. It has been exactly in line with our traditions in the great fight that the nation waged against British Imperialism.

The present phase of the movement started in May 1955, under the leadership of N. G. Goray, one of our foremost Party leaders. Since then we have been sending batches of satyagrahis under the leadership of comrades belonging to different political parties who had organised themselves into the Goa Vimochan Sahayak Samiti. These unarmed patriots received merciless beatings and even bullets from the Portuguese. Many a brave man laid down his life in this noble cause.

But then came the memorable day of August 15, when thousands of unarmed volunteers crossed into Goa, Daman and Diu, to be repulsed by showers of bullets from imperialist soldiers stationed inside these territories. In Daman, Ishwarlal Desai, a member of the National Executive and the foremost leader of the Gujarat PSP, led a batch of more than 1,200 peaceful satyagrahis. Jaswant Mehta led the satayagrahis on Diu front.

The Bombay Government was hostile to the Satyagraha even before the AICC called a halt to it. They deprived us of all means of transport. But it could not stop the brave patriots. Led by M. R. Dandavate, our valiant Joint Secretary, a batch of 1,500 volunteers marched on foot for more than sixty miles, in the pouring rain, and entered Goa territory to face Portuguese bullets and lathis.

The imperialists went absolutely mad on that day. They killed about twenty and maimed many more. The next day witnessed unique demonstrations throughout the length and breadth of the country. The Government and the Congress lost their nerves and sought to put a stop to the people's initiative.

But where is this policy leading us to? Nanasaheb Goray, Shiru Limaye, Ishwarlal Desai and others have been sentenced to ten years' imprisonment. Hundreds of Goan patriots have been captured. The military is ruling supreme there crushing the people. And our Government is sitting idle in the fond hope that diplomatic pressure will be able to induce Salazar to relinquish the hold on Goa, Daman and Diu?

We are one with the Government in rejecting Police Action or armed clash of any kind. The only alternative is peaceful mass satyagraha. But the Government rejects both. It is senseless to expect half a million unarmed Goanese to resist the armed might of Portugal. Indians have to play their part in it. And the only way in which they can play their part in tune with our traditions and the path chosen by us is to launch a peaceful mass satyagraha. Recent developments have made it clear that no diplomatic pressure is going to succeed. Between Khrushchev and Dulles, Goa has become a pawn in Big Power politics. The issue is nowhere near solution.

We have therefore to pledge ourselves to start a nation-wide movement and force the Government of India to allow unarmed and peaceful Indian satyagrahis to cross the border. That is the only way we can bring succour to the Goan patriots who are fighting with their backs to the wall.

The resolution was adopted unanimously. (see Appendix C).

The Chairman now requested Com. Wijono, Secretary General of Asian Socialist Conference, who had arrived at Gaya on the previous day, to convey to the Conference the message of the Asian Socialist Conference.

Com. Wijono then read out the message on behalf of U Ba Swe, Chairman, Asian Socialist Conference. (see messages.)

The discussion on the Policy Statement was then resumed and the Chairman called upon Shrimati Anutai Limaye to speak.

DISCUSSION ON POLICY STATEMENT Contd.

Anutai Limaye (Maharashtra): I support the Policy Statement. We could have certainly postponed its adoption by a few months if we were passing through normal times. As it is, we will be only inviting further confusion and disruption if we decide in favour of postponement.

I find that criticism has centered round only two issues : class struggle and our strategy in the coming general elections. Both these issues can be decided here by the votes of the delegates. Why postpone it to a later date?

I do not stand for class struggle, that is, I do not believe in it as a principle. But, at the same time, I cannot close my eyes to its existence. It is a hard reality and has to be faced. The struggle between the exploiters and the exploited goes on endlessly and in this struggle we cannot but side with the exploited. There is only one condition. It shall not be violent. We have already accepted this limitation, not as a matter of policy or strategy but as a matter of principle and reasoned conviction. Under no circumstances shall we budge from it. We have, in fact, evolved a fine synthesis of class struggle and satyagraha. There is no contradiction between the two. Non-violent class struggle and change of heart can and must go together. If our objectives can be achieved by change of heart, we would be happy. But if there is no change of heart we must fight with non-violent methods.

In regard to the question of electoral alliances and adjustments, I am of the definite opinion that we can, under no circumstances, support the Communists and the Communalists. The Congress, it is true, stands for democracy and is therefore nearer to us than the other parties. But we are distressed to find that there are increasing indications of the Congress drifting away from the genuine democratic path. Authoritarian tendencies are increasing and we have to build up a strong opposition to check this process. We cannot enter into an alliance with the Congress.

I would therefore strongly press for the adoption of the Policy Statement as it is.

Asoka Mehta (Bombay City): This is probably the first occasion since the formation of the PSP that I am seeking an opportunity to place before you my views on the various developments. At the Allahabad Conference I had not spoken. At Nagpur my observations were very brief. I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating you for the remarkable manner in which you have faced successive difficulties and surmounted the crisis. A party which is capable of facing such sharp difficulties is capable of facing the future with hope and confidence. As far as I am concerned I believe in the Party and have faith in its future. I would also like to take this opportunity to pay my respectful tribute to Acharya Narendra Deva, who has saved the Party from crisis by the strength of his unique personality, and I hope that before we disperse we shall not only send him a message

wishing speedy recovery of his health but also extolling the unique service rendered by him to the Party.

As far as the Policy Statement is concerned, I know that a number of you are perturbed and are wondering as to what I would say. In the past I have sometimes said things that have irritated you. If I have done that, it was to bring sharply to your attention the great responsibilities and opportunities we face in our country. In India, perhaps more than in any other country of the world, the unprecedented experiment of developing our economy through democratic means and process is going on. Nowhere in the world has that attempt been made. People have either sought and achieved democracy or have embraced development. For the first time in history our country is seeking to achieve both the objectives simultaneously. We have also been trying to shape our destiny in the light of the experience of the past generations. Socialism at one time was an idea, an evocative philosophy, but it is now practised and worked out in the various countries of the world. With such a rich heritage of theory and practice, we are trying to work out our destiny ourselves. We have always been trying to find out a new path in conformity with the ideals we cherish.

I recognise the supreme value of the teachings of Marx. In the socialist movement a great debate has gone on between Marxists and non-Marxists. The debate has taken place in our Party also. But it may be pointed out in no democratic socialist party in the world today is the effort being made to accept the Marxian framework as necessary and fundamental to the party. I do not think that any European Socialist Party today insists upon the acceptance of Marxist principles of socialism as a prerequisite to membership. They believe that it is not wise to bind the party to this ideology. While Marxists are always welcome, no obstacles are put in the way of non-Marxists. Pragmatic issues weigh far more than ideological questions. Then again the vital issues that have come up are not capable of easy solution within the traditional thought structure of Marxism. Take, for instance, the sectorial conflict. The fundamental question that the socialist movement faces in India is not the conflict of classes but the conflict of sectors, between the capital goods and consumers goods sectors, the conflict between urban and rural areas. The communists tried to achieve industrial development at the expense of the peasants and the consumers. It is possible to organise the capital structure of our economy at the expense of the peasants, but it would involve terrible suffering and blast the foundations of democracy. Class conflict is concerned primarily with the process of distribution. Due to new techniques and fiscal weapons that modern governments have evolved, it is possible to organise the redistribution of income equitably. Through budgetary measures and economic measures, maldistribution can be checked to a considerable extent, without resorting to crude forms of class struggle. What is crucial however is to achieve the needed adjustment between sectors, on which depends

the development of production.

We have not mentioned anything in our Policy Statement about the correlation between agriculture and economic development and the impact of the latter on the peasants and other allied problems pointedly raised by Jayaprakash Narayan. Economic development ultimately depends upon the building up of economy at a rate faster than the growth of your population. In order that we move faster, have more jobs for the people, make production more and more capital intensive, we have to increase savings in economy. What the planners in India, Indonesia and Israel are trying to attempt is to raise the proportion of saving from 5 per cent to 12 per cent or more of the national income. In order to increase even 1 per cent in national income we have to invest $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. How can we raise the rate of saving?

I have myself experienced the miseries of our people. I know the harm done to political life and democracy by the Congress Party. But that should not blind us to facts and realities. Between 1951 and 1961 India is being changed. Do you want the targets of the planners to be achieved or not, and will their achievement help the country or not? I give below various figures in this connection :

Area irrigated	75% increase
Electricity	200% „
Production of Steel	400% „
Production of Sugar	100% „
Production of Mill Cloth	60% „
Production of Handmade Cloth	100% „
Production of Khadi	300% „

We cannot say that nothing is being done. There is the darker side of the picture also. 10 per cent of the population is unemployed and the figures may go still higher in future. 50 per cent of our children do not receive even elementary education. The administration at lower levels is oppressive. Social change in rural areas is almost non-existent. But development is taking place and nothing is gained by denying it. What is needed is elaboration of policies and classification of problems to accelerate the pace of development and reduce the area of neglect and frustration. Elimination of unemployment, for instance, demands efforts, projects, plans; means and wherewithals have to be found and mobilised. With this Policy Statement I do not think we can go to the people and say that we have a solution of unemployment problem.

Take another problem. In the next Five Year Plan deficit financing is to be resorted to. Printing of notes will lead to inflation but if this deficit financing is accompanied by organised efforts of the people to augment production we can through deficit financing achieve economic development and increased employment. In any plan of economic development, about 50 per cent is spent upon constructive work where no consumable goods are

produced. That exerts an inflationary pressure. Even in the next Plan, out of 8 million jobs which are to be created, 2 million are to be created in the construction work group. Of course the development will put money into the hands of the people, the workers. If more foodgrains, sugar and cloth are not produced, there would be a rise in prices and added misery. The increased production, particularly if it is to come from small-scale efforts, demands co-operation and organisation, not struggles. But if we let things slide down and hope to overcome misery through struggles we might allow communists or communalists to outbid us. It is my confirmed view that socialist forces grow only in the context of development, not disintegration. A shattered society demands not constructive work alone but organic healing, community building : the cells have to set working. Jayaprakash Narayan, I think, with his devotion to community building and social regeneration, is a real socialist than anybody else sitting here.

At this historic moment when we have to reconcile the claims of development with those of democracy, the Party should think more of the people than of itself. Its advantages must be viewed as a by-product and not as the central aim of our efforts. We should help to provide our economy with its missing component of popular organisations. We must try to cultivate informed opinion which will fight for egalitarian society not just as an end in itself but also as a means to evoking greater efforts and sacrifices for the reconstruction of India. It is our supreme responsibility to uncover the functional significance of socialism to India. That is why I find it difficult to approve of overemphasis on ideology.

Suraj Narayan Singh (Bihar) : We have two kinds of political parties in existence. The sole aim of one is to capture political power by any means. The other type stands first and foremost for social change and desires political power only if it helps in the process. The PSP, I believe, is of the second variety. We are a party of social change above anything else. We therefore cannot do without a clear ideology and a definite Policy Statement in which we clearly enunciate the fundamental principles that guide and inspire us. What we need is revolutionary determination and courage to forge ahead in spite of all hurdles in the way. This is not dogmatism. We have never been dogmatic. During our brief span of twenty years or so we have more than once demonstrated our capacity to change our ideas and practice. From Meerut to this day we have been continuously evolving. We live in a changing world and the Party will not be socialist if it remains static. We do not refuse to evolve further. We want to keep our minds alert and imbibe whatever is necessary for our mental growth. Let us adopt this document as a fundamental restatement of our basic principles and ideals. If the situation calls for it we can amend it at any time. Only, let us be convinced about it. Just now we are convinced that this Policy Statement adequately expresses what we have been standing for all these

years. The delegates can make any amendments that they like. But let us adopt it here and not postpone it.

Raja Kulkarni (Bombay) : I want to draw your attention to the question of mounting unemployment in the country. Have we any plan for ending it? Different theories have come up recently and the question has given rise to a lot of controversy in the country. I find that our own ideas on the problem are rather patchy and lack definite shape. What alternative have we to offer? The country has a right to expect an answer from us. But this Policy Statement does not give any clear indication of our stand. I really feel that we have not been able to meet the challenge thrown out by Nehru. We cannot meet it by a negative policy. We cannot simply say we oppose further taxation. We have to specify if we can suggest any alternate sources of revenue for our economic planning. Again, I feel that much more thought needs to be devoted to the question of public and private sectors of our industry. The Policy Statement deals mainly with the fundamentals. I feel that it is not enough. Our Policy Statement should have something definite to say on the burning problems facing our country. It will not do to approach all the questions from the point of view of class struggle. Class struggle is not our objective. Our objective is socialist transformation. We have to learn to look at all problems from the angle of socialist transformation and not class struggle. All this leads me to feel that we should not adopt this Statement in haste. It needs further mature consideration. It will do us no harm if we postpone it by a few months.

M. R. Dandavate (Bombay City) : I emphatically refute the suggestion that by adopting this Policy Statement we run the risk of becoming doctrinaire or dogmatic. Just compare this document with the previous theses adopted by the Party in the twentyone years of its existence. Compare it with the Meerut Thesis of the old Congress Socialist Party. Since that date we have changed considerably. The author of this Policy Statement Acharya Narendra Deva of 1955 is quite a different person from Acharya Narendra Deva of 1934, because he has shown the resilience of mind to accept the new contributions to our thinking. Nobody talked of decentralisation of economic power and devolution in those days. But we have all these ideas incorporated in the Policy Statement. Other fundamentals has been restated here. Everything has been re-examined in the light of continuously evolving social thought and the changing objective situation. It is certainly not a dogma.

The idea of class struggle as advanced here is not the same old orthodox concept. It has been presented in a new context of non-violent and democratic forms of struggle. We are not making class struggle our aim. It is only the means to an end. We have to test our policies on the touchstone of realities. Who can say that class struggle is not a reality today? You may

delete the words *class struggle* from the Policy Statement. But can you eliminate class struggle from our present-day society wherein class exploitation exists?

There was some reference to values in our discussion. I agree that there are values that are permanent and values that are relative. We have to consider the environmental conditions in which these values operate. I do not wish to raise the controversy as to whether the values are permanent or relative. The crucial problem is that even those who accept permanent nobler values are denied the opportunities to practise those values in their lives. What happened during the great calamity in Bengal in 1943? Even the most respectable poor women had to choose prostitution in order to avoid destruction. They had faith in chastity but the environment prevented them from giving expression to that value in their own lives.

The Policy Statement lays special emphasis on moral values and good means. Moral appeals have their own effect and no one denies it. They no doubt elevate the moral level of our struggle. But I do not think a whole society can be fundamentally altered simply by means of moral appeals. Nor do we believe that parliamentary method is the only instrument of social change. It is only one of the methods. I am strongly of the opinion that parliamentary struggles alone would not lead us anywhere. We have to give due consideration to extra-parliamentary activities which include non-violent struggle against injustice as well as constructive work. The Policy Statement has ably dealt with this point in the chapter *Transition to Socialism*.

I am all for flexibility of thought. But it should not be stressed beyond limits to a breaking point. Flexibility should not mean that we have no ground to stand on, that we have no guiding principle. We must evolve a distinctive place and role for our Party. The Policy Statement allows co-operation with the Congress as well as other political parties in the constructive field but it rightly warns Party members to guard against futile controversies of co-operation with the Congress and general appeals for national consolidation.

Electoral adjustments with the Congress or the Communists would ring our deathknell. Let us learn from our experience in Travancore-Cochin, where we entered into an electoral adjustment with the Communists. Let us build a healthy and conscious party on sure and stable foundations. Let us enter the electoral contest on our own strength.

There might be a few ideas here and there in the Policy Statement which need further clarification. If so, you can come forward with your amendments at this Conference or at the next Conference. But we have to adopt certain fundamental principles. This Policy Statement has tried to achieve a unique synthesis and has given us a social philosophy. I do not think that we can run the Party merely on the basis of a programme. It may be possible to run a government on that basis, but not a party that calls itself socialist. The Party needs an ideology that can infuse

faith among Party members and give them political direction. The Policy Statement has fulfilled this need. Let us adopt this Statement here and now.

The Chairman called upon Prof. Raja Ram Shastri to reply to the debate.

Prof. Raja Ram Shastri (Uttar Pradesh): Fortunately there has been no very strong opposition to the Policy Statement as a whole. My task in replying to the debate is therefore not very difficult.

Munshi Ahmed Din does not seem to have studied the document carefully. The Policy Statement contains no passages that can be interpreted as a praise for the Soviet system. It has, on the other hand, very effectively exposed it. Even in his Chairman's Address, Acharya Narendra Deva has said that his appreciation of the Soviets has always been critical. I would request Munshi Ahmed Din to study the document again.

It is true, as has been pointed out by Karpoori Thakur, that the document has no chapter on education. Acharya Narendra Deva is a great educationist. I do not know whether all his ideas on education can be compressed into a small chapter. But we can certainly request him to add a chapter on education.

Acharya Kripalani has said that the Policy Statement is a mixture and not a compound, that it is only an amalgamation and not a synthesis. With due respect to him I would point out that it is a coherent whole. There are no discordant voices in it, no conflict between its various parts. Acharya Kripalani has not given one instance in proof of his contention. It may have other faults but certainly not this. This has not come about accidentally. It has come about thus because we have been very careful about it. From the views of all our great leaders we have taken only what was rational and what could fit into the general pattern of the ideology of democratic socialism. We have scrupulously discarded all that was mystic or irrational or untenable. That is why we have before us a coherent whole.

It has been contended here by some that the Party should have no ideology. I humbly differ from it. It is my conviction that no fruitful work can be carried on in practice without the guidance provided by an underlying ideology. Everyone, in fact, has some ideology or the other, however unconscious it might be. Even those who say that we need not have any ideology have in fact an ideology of their own. What they are against is not all ideology but some particular ideology. Why not say so frankly? Politics may be pragmatic. But mere pragmatism has always led to opportunism. We certainly do not stand for this type of politics. We have our ideals and we have entered politics to translate these ideals into reality. Mere politics has neither meaning nor interest for us.

Gandhiji has taught us that ideas alone do not suffice. They have to be accompanied by definite action in a definite direction.

Otherwise, they become barren and lifeless. That is why this Policy Statement includes class struggle as a means to the achievement of our ideals. What, after all, is there in the conception of class struggle to scare anyone away, particularly when it has been definitely stated that it should be peaceful and non-violent. It has been envisaged here as taking the shape of satyagraha and peaceful strikes.

It has been sought to prove that satyagraha aims at suffering injury and not inflicting it on others. This purely negative conception does not do justice to Gandhiji. Coupled with the exploded belief in the omnipotence of ideas it ends in the barren politics of liberalism and parliamentary electionism which was as irrelevant to the Gandhian way as violence itself. We have always conceived satyagraha as an active form of pressure, an exercise of people's will, which is as much removed from undemocratic violent force as from ineffective constitutionalism. It is not sufficiently realised that what was abhorrent to Gandhiji was violence and all his contributions in political technique are direct corollaries of the central principle of non-violence.

Struggle against injustice and exploitation cannot be confined to the towns and cities. It has to be waged wherever there is injustice, exploitation and oppression—more so in the villages today than in the towns. Class struggle is not waged only against the landlords or millowners. It is a struggle between two social orders, between capitalism and socialism. It will last as long as the capitalist system of society exists and will not vanish with the disappearance of landlords. Class struggle can also take place, and does take place, between those who live in villages and those who live in the towns, between those who produce agricultural goods and those who produce industrial goods. Class struggle can thus take a myriad shapes. It is a reality and we are forced to think of it. But we do not want to merely intensify class struggle. We want above all to promote socialist consciousness.

There is no conflict or contradiction between the non-violent class struggle and bhoodan, as some imagine. The importance of the bhoodan movement lies in the evolution of one great principle. Vinoba has asked for bhoodan and *sampatti dan* not only from the rich but also from the poor and the exploited. This gives rise to the significant idea that if the poor, who form the majority in society, themselves give up the sense of greed and ownership, they lay such a siege of the exploiting minority which is difficult for them to break. In fact, through this movement the poor by themselves create a new society and new social values which will take away from money and privilege their glamour and respectability. The exploiting few, living in the midst of this new society and facing its disapproval and opposition, will have no guts left to stick to their possessions. We cannot minimise the great import of this idea. In this moral strategy of popular pressure lies the synthesis of class struggle and *Ahimsa*. *Bhoodan*, thus, seeks to create social consciousness and solidarity among the actual tillers of the soil and galvanise that consciousness into a great

and powerful mass movement for redistribution of land and socialisation of all property. And in this it is a definite ally of the socialist movement.

Asoka Mehta has referred to the conflict between different sectors of production. It is no doubt there. But there is nothing new in what he has said. As I have already pointed out, conflict between sectors is also a form of the wider class struggle. It does not disprove class conflict. On the other hand, if anything, it proves the existence of classes and conflict between their interests.

This Policy Statement has not been drafted in terms of Marxism but of democratic socialism. We recognise that socialism has advanced much since Marx wrote his memorable and inspiring works. In fact, this document is a striking testimony of this fact.

There has been some talk of values also. There are no doubt absolute values, like truth and non-violence. But these values are often exploited by the exploiters of society for their ends. Moral values degenerate in the hands of capitalists and exploiters. Destruction of class society and exploitation can alone restore to moral values their proper and due place.

Asoka Mehta has advocated the adoption of a bi-partisan policy in national affairs. It is a noble sentiment. Maybe, he is correct. I only want to point out that when a weak opposition party clamours for it, more likely than not it is liable to be misunderstood. It will be taken as a clamour for a share in the loaves and fishes of office. It will do no one any good. One could understand him if we were the ruling party. But today it is the Congress that is in the saddle, not we. It is for the ruling party always to seek to create a bi-partisan or a national policy. But the ruling party today ridicules the idea. It equates itself with the nation. How can there be a bi-partisan policy under these circumstances?

I have not come across any convincing reason in favour of postponing the adoption of this Policy Statement. I would, therefore, urge you to adopt it here before you disperse.

With Prof. Raja Ram Shastri's reply the general discussion on the Policy Statement concluded.

M. R. Dandavate then moved that the Policy Statement be basically accepted by the Conference and that all amendments, except those referring to electoral alliances and adjustments, be referred to Acharya Narendra Deva and the National Executive.

This proposal, however, was opposed by Sarangdhar Das and some other delegates and was dropped.

The Chairman, then, moved that the "The House generally adopts the Policy Statement."

The proposal was carried by an overwhelming majority. (See Appendix C for resolution).

The Conference then adjourned.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1955

MORNING—DELEGATES SESSION

The Conference assembled at 9 a.m.

AMENDMENTS TO PARTY CONSTITUTION

The Chairman : We will now take up the amendments to the Party Constitution. Prem Bhasin will explain to you their background as well as move them on behalf of the National Executive.

Prem Bhasin (Punjab) : The present Constitution of the PSP was adopted at the Indore General Council meeting. Since then many things have happened in the Party. We have encountered some practical difficulties during the past year and a half. For instance, when Madhu Limaye was suspended from membership by the Bombay City Branch, it was found that the Party Constitution contained no provision for appeal against disciplinary action taken by the National or Provincial Executive Committees of the Party. The National Executive, therefore, decided to recommend suitable amendments to the Constitution at the National Conference.

The matter was discussed thoroughly at the camp meeting of the National Executive held at Jaipur in July 1955. The whole Constitution was reviewed clause by clause and many concrete suggestions emerged. A committee consisting of Ganga Sharan Sinha, H. V. Kamath and Prem Bhasin was then appointed to draft the amendments in the light of these suggestions.

These suggestions were circulated to all provincial branches and they were invited to send their reactions as well as fresh suggestions to the committee. In spite of many reminders, however, I am sorry to say, many provincial branches did not respond. A few did send their suggestions, which were considered by the committee.

The draft amendments prepared by this committee were again discussed by the National Executive at Lucknow and generally approved.

A group meeting of representatives of all provincial branches was held at Gaya on 27th night to discuss these draft amendments and I am glad to report that we were able to reach agreed conclusions on all issues except that of membership fee.

As you will see from the draft before you, most of the amendments are verbal and are not of a vital nature. The most important amendments relate to the qualifications of active members, shifting the emphasis from money paid to work done, and the provision for a tribunal of appeal against disciplinary actions taken by the National and Provincial Executives. Another amendment makes it obligatory for National and Provincial delegates to be active members of the Party. On all these there is no difference of opinion among Party workers and I hope you will have no

difficulty in accepting these.

I will proceed article by article.

ARTICLE III

Prem Bhasin : In clause 2, add the words *or communal* after the word *political*.

The amendment was passed unanimously.

Kenchappa (Mysore) : Before you move on to the next clause I would like to move two minor amendments of a verbal nature. In clause 2, add the word *years* after *18* and the word *any* before the word *communal*. My amendments, if accepted, would make the clause more clear.

Prem Bhasin : I accept both these amendments.

The amendments were accepted unanimously.

In the note under clause 2, substitute the word *Note* by the word *Explanation*, and add the word *communal* after the word *political*.

In clause 3, after the words *recognised by the Party*, add the following : *and does not observe caste and communal distinctions*.

In the Note under clause 3, substitute the word *Note* by the word *Explanation*.

The amendments were passed unanimously.

ARTICLE IV

Kenchappa (Mysore) : I move that clause 1 should be substituted by the following : *Each member shall pay a membership fee of annas eight per annum*.

Allow me to say a few words in its support. Membership fee of Re. 1/- per annum is too high. India is a poor country and we experience great difficulty in enrolling members when the membership fee is Re. 1/-. If we want to create a mass party we must reduce the membership fee.

P. R. Vasavda (Bombay City) : I move that the clause should be substituted by the following : *Each member shall pay a membership fee of annas four per annum*.

I strongly feel that a time has come for increasing our membership and to become a strong political party. I do not think we can achieve this objective without reducing the membership fee to annas four per annum.

Ranendra Mohan Das (Utkal) : I oppose both these amendments. I am for retaining the membership fee at Re. 1/- per

annum. We should not make our Party cheap in this manner. Those who enrol themselves after paying Re. 1/- each take the membership seriously and devote some thought to it. But those who pay half or one quarter of this amount will take it lightly and we shall not be able to attract serious-minded persons to our Party. If we accept anyone of these two amendments we shall undermine the foundations of our Party.

Prem Bhasin : I strongly oppose both these amendments. This is not the first time in the history of our Party that the question of reducing the membership fee has come up. A long debate has been going on in the Party over it. I have only a few points to make and would request the delegates to give them their cool and dispassionate consideration. It has been argued that we cannot increase our membership because the membership fee is too high for a country like India. This contention is not supported by facts. Twice within the last few years, we have experimented with reduced membership fee. Did our membership figures leap up as a result? No. Over the past few years our membership figures have not fluctuated much. It goes to prove that membership figures do not depend essentially on the membership fee. They depend on the amount of work our Party puts in and on how sustained and useful that work is. It has been our experience that membership does not appreciably go up with a reduction in the amount of the membership fee nor does it go down with a rise in it. Let us not delude ourselves and try to seek an easy way out. We cannot broaden the base of our Party by making the membership cheaper. We can do it only by hard work. There is no short cut.

Apart from this, on what basis do we enrol our members? Do we have conscious members or anyone who can be persuaded to pay a particular amount of money? Do we try to enrol persons who understand what the Party stands for and subscribe to it? I am sure that those who are convinced about these things would never hesitate to pay the paltry sum of Re. 1/- to the Party. This amount may be too high for those who have no faith in or knowledge of the Party. You will, therefore, have to decide what type of membership you want to recruit for your Party.

I would draw your attention to still another and perhaps the most important factor. How are our Central, Provincial and District offices to run? There was a time when practically the whole Party, at all levels, was being run on funds raised by Jayaprakash Narayan. That period, as we all know, has now become a part of history. Much though we regret it, it has also taught us a lesson. The Party should not depend on one or more individuals for its finances. It must stand on its own legs. It must be able to raise the money it needs for carrying on its activities from its members. Otherwise, this Party will never cultivate self-confidence. We have adopted a new Policy Statement under circumstances which you all know. It has certain practical implications. I do not want to go into these. Suffice

it to say that hereafter the ordinary members of the Party will have to shoulder the responsibility of financing the Party at all levels. I would therefore beg you not to reduce the membership fee.

Sarangdhar Das (Utkal) : I want to emphasise that after having adopted this Policy Statement the Party will have to stand on its own legs in matters of finance. You will have to provide leadership to the Party and begin to train new people from now on. All this will need more money, not less, and that too at a time when our capacity to raise money from sources outside the Party is practically zero. Do not therefore give a crippling blow to Party finances by reducing the membership fee.

The Chairman : I can say from personal experience that it is difficult to enrol members at the fee of Re.1/- each. We claim that we are a party of the poor and for the poor; but by fixing the membership fee so high we make it impossible for the poor to get into the Party and influence its decisions. This is a basic contradiction and we must remove it. We condemn the Congress as a party of the rich, but their membership fee is one quarter that of ours. The argument of finance does not appeal to me. Party offices are important, but they cannot claim priority over the party itself. They have to be run with whatever little resources we have. I am therefore strongly of the opinion that we should reduce our membership fee to annas eight.

Now there are two amendments before us, one seeking to reduce the membership fee to annas eight and the other to annas four. But I find there is no unanimity on the question of reducing the membership fee at all. Let us therefore decide this question first.

When put to vote a majority was found to be in favour of reducing the membership fee. The Chairman, then declared the result.

Prem Bhasin : I want to point out that no amendment to the Party Constitution can be adopted with less than two-thirds majority.

The Chairman : Show me the relevant portion in the Constitution.

Prem Bhasin then read out article XVII of the Constitution : *Amendments to the Constitution of the Party can only be made at the National Conference by two-thirds majority of those present and voting.*

The Chairman : All right. The Constitution is very clear about it. It is evident that if this amendment is to be passed it must have two-thirds majority. I would, therefore, put it to vote again.

When put to vote a large majority of delegates raised their hands in favour of the amendment.

Prem Bhasin at first asked for division but later conceded that it was evident from the hands raised for and against the amendment that it commanded two-thirds majority.

The Chairman thereupon declared the amendment carried.

M. S. Gokhale (Madhya Pradesh) : A point of order. Two-thirds majority was not ascertained at the time of adopting previous amendments. As such, they cannot be considered to have been constitutionally adopted.

The Chairman : No objection was raised at that time and nobody questioned the result. I therefore overrule the objection.

Now let us proceed to the next point. Having decided that membership fee should be reduced from Re.1, we have yet to decide whether it should be reduced to annas eight or annas four. I would therefore put both these amendments to vote.

When put to vote, the amendment reducing the membership fee to annas eight was declared carried by an overwhelming majority.

The Chairman : Let us proceed to the next clause.

Prem Bhasin : Please refer to clause 2. The amendment proposed is : Delete the words *the minimum contribution being Rs. 3/-* and add a new sentence at the end : *He shall also collect a minimum of Rs. 3/- annually for Party funds.*

Rajendra Sharma (Bihar) : My amendment is that an active member should be required to enrol at least 25 members in addition to collecting a minimum amount of funds for the Party.

Vedantta Hemmiga (Mysore) : I propose that an active member should also be required to put in at least twelve hours of work for the Party in a week.

Suraj Narayan Singh (Bihar) : My amendment is that an active member should be required to enrol at least 15 Party members and one subscriber for the Party organ.

Keshari Pandey (Uttar Pradesh) : I propose that an active member should collect Rs. 3/- annually for the Party and, in addition, enrol at least 10 members in a year.

Prem Bhasin : I am prepared to accept the last amendment requiring an active member to enrol at least 10 Party members in addition to collecting Rs. 3/- annually for Party funds.

I do not think we should raise this number to 25 or even 15. Let us start with 10 and see how it works out in practice. I have no objection to making it obligatory for an active member to enrol at least one subscriber for the Party organ, as proposed by Suraj Narayan Singh. But I would advise patience at this stage. Let us hasten slowly. But I am definitely opposed to the amendment seeking to fix a minimum number of hours of work for active members. We have had experience of such clauses in the past. In the Constitution of the old Socialist Party, for instance, there was a clause which required an active member to put in at least 14 hours of work in a week. But it was found wanting and was dropped later on. The difficulty with such clauses is that it becomes hard to enforce them and they remain mostly dead letters. On the other hand, such clauses tend to be exploited in group rivalries in local units. The result is that instead of toning up Party organisation it produces a very unhealthy effect. I do not think we should expose our Party to such unhealthy practices.

All the amendments were then put to vote. All other amendments having been rejected, the following amendment was declared carried.

Article IV, clause 2. Delete the words *the minimum contribution being Rs. 3/-* and add a new sentence at the end : *He shall also collect a minimum of Rs. 3/- annually for Party funds and enrol at least 10 Party members.*

ARTICLE V

Prem Bhasin : All amendments to this Article are non-controversial and I am sure you will adopt them unanimously. The amendments are :

1. In Clause 1 (e) add at the end the following words : *only for the purpose of co-ordinating the activities of the component units.*

2. After clause 1 (f), add a new clause : 1 (g) *A City Branch enjoying the status of a Provincial Branch shall have Primary Units and Constituency Branches but not District Branches.*

3. In clause 3 (b), substitute the word *residing* by the word *enrolled*.

4. After clause 3 (b) add a new clause :

3 (c) *A primary member may have his membership transferred from the roll of one Primary Unit to that of another with the approval of the Provincial Secretary where the two Primary Units belong to the same Provincial Branch, and with the approval of the General Secretary where the two Primary Units belong to the different Provincial Branches.*

All the amendments when put to vote were adopted unanimously.

ARTICLE VI

Prem Bhasin : You have to make a little change in the draft amendment. Delete the words *as far as possible annually* and substitute in its place the words *usually once a year*. This change is the result of our discussions at the group meeting held on December 27. I therefore hope there will be no difficulty in adopting it. The draft amendment would read as follows :

In clause 1, substitute the words *The National Conference of the Party shall be convened annually* by the words *The National Conference of the Party shall be convened usually once a year*.

The Chairman : I think the original draft was more precise. Why not stick to that?

Prem Bhasin : I have no objection.

Sibnath Banerji (West Bengal) : I oppose both the draft amendments. I would like to stick to the original provision in the Constitution. We must have our National Conferences annually and not *as far as possible annually*. The amendment, if carried, would give a loophole for the Executive to perpetuate itself by not holding the National Conference on some ground or other.

Prem Bhasin : We had discussed all these fears and suspicions at the group meeting and had agreed that they were baseless. Perhaps Sibnath Banerji did not attend the group meeting, otherwise he would not have raised this point. Briefly speaking, this amendment has arisen out of experience. In practice it is not always possible to hold the National Conference exactly within a year. Many things can intervene. Floods, for example. The host province might find it impossible to make arrangements under the circumstances. And, then again, we are most likely to have General Elections in early 1957. In that case it may not be possible to hold the next conference in 1956. These are practical difficulties. If we reject this amendment, our next conference might become unconstitutional.

When put to vote, the amendment was declared carried, with 140 for and 66 against.

ARTICLE VII

Prem Bhasin : Add the following new clause after clause 2.

3. *The National General Council shall not take disciplinary action against any member or Committee, nor shall it entertain any appeal against any disciplinary action taken by the National or Provincial Executive.*

The amendment was agreed to unanimously.

ARTICLE VIII

Prem Bhasin : This is only a verbal amendment. In clause 1(a) substitute the words *and 23 members* by the words *and not more than 23 members*.

Sibnath Banerji (West Bengal) : We must also fix a minimum number. I would suggest 15.

Prem Bhasin : I accept the suggestion. The draft amendment would now read as follows :

Substitute clause 1(a) by the following :

The National Executive, elected by the National Conference, shall ordinarily consist of the Chairman, the General Secretary and members who shall not be less than 15 and not more than 23.

The amendment was carried unanimously.

Ramanand Tiwari (Bihar) : Allow me to move an amendment here before you move on to the next draft amendment. I am sure it is non-controversial and would be accepted by all. The amendment is : Add a new sub-clause after sub-clause 1(a) :

1. (b) *The National Executive shall elect a Deputy Chairman, from amongst its members, on the recommendation of the Chairman.*

Prem Bhasin : I accept this amendment.

S. Ahmadi (Uttar Pradesh) : I oppose this amendment. My reason is very simple. Constitutional provisions should be based on relatively permanent and not transient considerations. I do not say that new posts should not be created. But we should not create a new post of a Deputy Chairman simply because our present Chairman is ill.

Ramanand Tiwari's amendment was then put to vote and carried by an overwhelming majority.

Prem Bhasin : I refer you again to the draft amendments. Add a new clause after clause 1(c) :

(e) *The National Executive shall elect a Tribunal consisting of three members, other than office-bearers of the Party, which shall have the power to entertain and decide appeals against any disciplinary action taken by the National or Provincial Executive Committee of the Party. The Tribunal shall not take any disciplinary action on its own.*

Gurcharan Singh Bhatia (Delhi) : I propose an amend-

ment to the draft amendment. After the words *other than office-bearers of the Party* add the words *and members of the National Executive*.

Prem Bhasin : I accept the amendment.

The amended draft amendment was unanimously adopted.

Clause 1(d) was then taken up. The draft amendment was:

After the words *Any vacancy in the National Executive* add the words *and the Tribunal*.

The amendment was unanimously adopted.

ARTICLE X

Prem Bhasin : I refer you to clause 1(a). Add the words *as far as possible* before the word *annually*. Also substitute the words *District Councils of the Party in the Province* by the words *delegates to the Provincial Conference*.

In clause 2(b) delete the words *political and organisational*.

Both these amendments were unanimously adopted.

Prem Bhasin : Please refer to clause 3(a). The group meeting decided to amend this clause in the following manner:

The number of members of the Provincial Council, elected from amongst the delegates to the Provincial Conference, and the mode of their election shall be determined by the Provincial Executive.

Sibnath Banerji (West Bengal) : I propose that the mode of their election should be determined by the National Executive so that there is some uniformity in the Party.

Prem Bhasin : I accept this suggestion.

The draft amendment was further amended thus :

The number of members of the Provincial Council, elected from amongst delegates to the Provincial Conference, shall be determined by the Provincial Executive. The mode of election of members of the Provincial Council shall be determined by the National Executive.

The amendment was adopted unanimously.

Draft amendments to clause 4 were then taken up. The first amendment was : Substitute clause 4(a) by the following :

The Provincial Executive shall consist of the Chairman, the Secretary and not more than 19 members, elected by the Provincial Conference, and ex-officio members. The

Provincial Executive, on the recommendation of the Chairman and Secretary, shall appoint a Treasurer and not more than three Joint Secretaries who need not be its members. Any vacancy in the Provincial Executive shall be filled up by the Provincial Executive.

The second amendment was : Add two new sub-clauses after sub-clause (b) :

4. (c) *The Provincial Executive may frame rules which are not inconsistent with the Constitution or the Rules framed by the National Executive.*
4. (d) *The Provincial Executive shall submit regular reports to the Central Office of the Party, as directed by the latter.*

All these amendments were carried unanimously.

ARTICLE XI

The draft amendment was moved. It was that clause 5 should be substituted by the following :

The Constituency Councils shall be entitled to recommend to the District Executive Committees candidates for elections to Local Bodies, State Assemblies and the Lok Sabha.

Also substitute the word *Note* by the word *Explanation*.

The amendments were carried unanimously.

ARTICLE XII

The draft amendment was that clause 5 should be substituted by the following :

District Executive Committees shall be entitled to recommend to the respective Provincial Parliamentary Committees candidates for elections to Local Bodies, State Assemblies and the Lok Sabha.

The amendment was carried unanimously.

ARTICLE XIV

The draft amendment moved was that clause 2 should be substituted by the following :

No person shall be eligible to be elected as a delegate to the National Conference or a member of the National General Council or Provincial or District or City Council or any Executive Committee of the Party unless he is an active member of the Party.

The Chairman : I feel that this rule should also apply to candidates adopted by the Party for elections to

Union and State Legislatures. I have found at many places that members of Legislature hardly do any work, they do not care to attend even workers' meetings. I would, therefore, propose that there should be a constitutional provision making it obligatory for our candidates to Union and State Legislatures to be active members of the Party.

Prem Bhasin : I agree with the spirit of the Chairman's proposal. But it does not fit in here in this clause. I suggest that we incorporate it in the Rules.

The Chairman agreed to this suggestion and the draft amendment was unanimously adopted.

RULES

Prem Bhasin : We shall now take up the draft amendments to Rules framed by the National Executive under XVI of the Constitution.

1. In Rule 1, after the word *Chairman* add the words *or by the Chairman himself*.
2. In Rule 2 also, after the words *Provincial Chairman* add the words *or by the Provincial Chairman himself*.
3. Substitute Rule 3 by the following :
Meeting of any Executive Committee of the Party shall be convened on a requisition by not less than one third of the members of the respective Committees.
4. Rule 4 to be deleted.

All these amendments were carried unanimously.

Suraj Narayan Singh (Bihar) : I want to move the following amendment to Rule No. 6. Add a new sentence at the end : *Every member of the Union and State Legislatures shall pay at least 33 per cent of his salary and allowances to the Party which shall be distributed equally amongst the central, provincial, district or city and the constituency units concerned.*

The amendment was supported by Biswanath Pandit (Utkal), Devendra Prasad Singh (Bihar) and Karpoori Thakur (Bihar).

It was opposed by Triloki Singh, H. V. Kamath, Rajhans, M. R. Dandavate and by the Chairman.

The amendment to Rule No. 6 was then put to vote and was defeated.

Prem Bhasin : Let us move on now to the other amendments to the Rules.

5. In Rule 9, after the words *General Secretary* add the words *in consultation with the Chairman*.
6. In Rule 10, delete the words *single-member*.
7. Add a new Rule after Rule No. 10 :
A member whose name appears in the roll of one District Branch shall not be entitled to contest elections to a District or City Council of any other District.
8. Substitute Rule No. 14 by the following :
The membership year of the Party shall be reckoned from 1st June to 31st May.
9. Rule No. 15 to be deleted.
10. Add a new Rule after Rule No. 15.
The National Executive shall fix a date every year for the transfer of membership. For the purpose of Party elections transfer of membership completed by that date shall be valid for the year.
11. In Rule No. 20, add at the end the following words :
and shall have collected a minimum of Rs. 3/- and enrolled ten Party members in pursuance of Article IV 2 of the Constitution.

All these amendments were carried unanimously.

Ganga Sharan Sinha (Bihar) : I want to raise a point of order. These Rules are framed by the National Executive under Article XVI of the Constitution. Any amendment to these Rules made by the National Executive, therefore, need not come before the Conference for approval. I do not know why amendments to these Rules have been brought before the Conference.

Prem Bhasin : It has been done in pursuance of a decision taken by the National Executive.

V. S. Dandekar (Madhya Pradesh) : It was decided by the National Executive at Jaipur that the Rules and the Code of Conduct shall form part of the Constitution. It is, therefore, necessary that they should be brought before the Conference for its approval.

The Chairman : I have consulted the relevant provision in the Constitution in regard to the Rules and have come to the conclusion that the Constitution gives full authority to the National Executive to frame the Rules. The National Executive has therefore full authority to amend these Rules as well. Such Rules, and any amendments thereto, have only to be placed before the National Conference or the National General Council. They need not be approved by the National Conference. I therefore uphold Ganga Sharan's objection.

As the amended Rules have already been placed before the House no further discussion on these draft amendments is necessary.

But before we close I would like to move the House to adopt a constitutional amendment making it obligatory for

Party candidates to Union and State Legislatures to be active members of the Party.

Prem Bhasin : It was agreed by the Chairman as well as by the House that this idea could be incorporated in the Rules. Why not therefore refer it to the National Executive which has full power to make any amendment to the Rules?

The Chairman : I do not agree with this suggestion. I think it should form part of the Constitution itself so that there is no ambiguity about it.

Prem Bhasin : In my opinion it would be enough if it forms part of the Rules. Secondly, it is a perfectly new idea. All its implications have not been considered by the National or Provincial Executives of the Party. If adopted, this amendment may have far-reaching consequences. It is of a fundamental nature. It has been a recognised practice in the Party that no amendment of a fundamental nature should be moved at the Conference before it has been discussed by the National Executive. All the other amendments were discussed not only by the National Executive but also by the Provincial Executives and again in the group meeting of delegates held here. This particular amendment has not been discussed at all previous to this sitting of the Conference. I would therefore again request the Chairman to agree to refer it to the National Executive.

The Chairman : I do not agree that it is of such a fundamental nature as to necessitate its reference to the National Executive. New amendments have come up here also and have been adopted. Only it was decided to incorporate it in the Rules. Now that the Rules are not coming up before the Conference for approval, I go back to the original position and would like it to be incorporated in the Constitution. I am not convinced that it is necessary to refer it to the National Executive. The House can discuss and adopt it here as part of the Constitution.

Prem Bhasin : But where do we incorporate it? In which Article?

The Chairman : We can have a new Article or clause or fit it in some existing clause. For instance, incorporate the idea in Article VIII, clause 2(d), by adding after the words *Party Candidates* the following words *from amongst active members of the Party*. If this amendment is carried, the clause will read as follows :

to appoint a Parliamentary Board with power to finalise selection of Party candidates, from amongst active members of the Party, for elections to Union and State Legislatures, settle all disputes arising out of them and

co-ordinate, guide and control the parliamentary work of the Party.

The amendment was put to vote and carried.

THURSDAY—DECEMBER 29, 1955

AFTERNOON—DELEGATES SESSION

The Chairman : We shall now take up the amendments, one by one. Narendranath Das (West Bengal) would now move his amendment for the deletion of Chapter II.

Narendranath Das (West Bengal) : I withdraw my amendment.

The Chairman : Jyotish Mazumdar (West Bengal) would now move his amendment for the deletion of paragraphs 2 and 3 of Chapter I.

Jyotish Mazumdar (West Bengal) : I withdraw my amendment.

The Chairman : Narendranath Das (West Bengal) would now move his amendment for the deletion of the last three paragraphs of Chapter I.

Narendranath Das (West Bengal) : I withdraw both the amendments.

As a number of delegates had given notice of an amendment for the deletion of the last sentence in Chapter VII *Transition to Socialism*, the Chairman decided to take it up for discussion and called upon K. K. Bhattacharya to speak.

K. K. Bhattacharya (Uttar Pradesh) : I recommend the deletion of the last sentence in Chapter VII of the Draft Policy Statement because I think it would be unwise to bind the National Executive on the question of tactics. I have always opposed opportunism of every shade but I feel that occasions may arise when we have to enter into some kind of electoral alliance or adjustment with other opposition parties. We should leave the National Executive free to take a decision on the issue according to circumstances prevailing at the time.

Sunil Das (West Bengal) : I support the amendment

for the simple reason that matters of short-term strategy should not be included in a document containing fundamental principles of our ideology. Questions of this nature can be safely entrusted to the National Executive. An atmosphere of distrust towards the National Executive prevailed to a certain extent at Allahabad. Happily, the position is different now and I hope the delegates would not hesitate to repose trust in these matters in the National Executive.

Mathuradas Mehta (Bombay City) : I strongly feel that questions of strategy should be left to the National Executive. It should not be bound down in this manner. We are going to elect a new Executive here. Let us not suspect them even before it is formed. It is upto us to elect anyone we like. Let us, therefore, have confidence in them and leave the question of electoral adjustments to our elected leaders.

Sarangdhar Das (Utkal) : I strongly oppose this amendment. The sentence banning electoral adjustments with the Congress, the Communists and the communalists has been put in the Policy Statement on the basis of our past experience. Instances have not been wanting when even the National Executive allowed provincial branches to enter into adjustments with parties with whom we have fundamental differences. Some provincial branches, even candidates, on their own, have not hesitated to enter into all sorts of alliances just to win a seat or two. The experiment has cost us dearly and we do not want to repeat it. After having adopted this Policy Statement we have a firm base to stand on. Let us have faith in ourselves and work devotedly to create strong bases for the Party. The clamour for electoral adjustments arises only because we do not devote enough time and work to the creation of such bases and then try to find an easy way out by entering into united fronts which leads us nowhere. My appeal to you is to build up your own strength and not to try to find a short cut to power.

Farid Ansari (Uttar Pradesh) : Since the last four days I have been listening to the valuable debate on the Policy Statement. Several amendments that have been moved for the deletion of the last two lines in Chapter VII have prompted me to come before you. I oppose all these amendments for very cogent reasons.

I for one fail to understand why friends want to delete this sentence from the Draft Policy Statement. Its deletion means that you want to have electoral adjustment with the Congress. You have declared in the Political Resolution just passed in this Conference that the PSP will build up a strong opposition capable of providing the people with an alternative administration. Are you going to fulfil this role in alliance with the Congress? How can you build up a strong opposition with the help of the ruling party?

As regards the Communist Party its past record is well known to all of you. The Communist Party has betrayed the people and the country during the 1942 revolution. It supported the Muslim League for the division of the country. The responsibility of the bloodshed in the country after the partition is on their head too. Besides we are too honest and straight. Therefore, whenever we have joined the Communists on any political issue, it has been noticed that we have been pushed back and the Communists dominated the scene. On several occasions we have realised the mistake of having a united front with them due to their violating the terms of agreement or acting against the national interest. In Uttar Pradesh, during two recent by-elections, we had some sort of alliance or united front with the Communists. It was found that during the entire period of electioneering the Communists dominated the show. Even the flag of the PSP was not displayed in any election meetings, though the candidates were important members of the PSP. The election campaign was carried on by the Communist Party.

You remember in Travancore-Cochin we entered into an alliance with the Communist Party. There were clear instructions of the National Executive that there will not be any joint election campaign. But these instructions were thrown to the winds and joint election meetings of the PSP and the Communist Party were held there. Therefore, I feel that any adjustment or alliance with the Communist Party will not only mean giving respectability to the enemies of the country, introducing them to the people who have not yet forgotten the infidelity of the Communists and weakening our own Party.

One thing more. Some friends have said that we are a democratic party and therefore we should be willing to join any party to defeat the party in power. To them I humbly submit that we are not only a democratic party but a revolutionary party too. If the situation arises where the whole people revolt against the tyranny of the Congress Government, we will lead that revolt and capture power by peaceful revolutionary means. I will prefer winning one seat on our own strength to winning 20 seats in alliance with parties that have never been loyal to India. That will be betraying the trust of the voters who cast their votes in our favour.

I find that delegates from only those provinces where the Party organisation is weak are in favour of the amendments. You build up your organisation from now on, strengthen the Party, popularise the Party programme and policy and the people will trust you and will give their votes to the PSP. But you must serve the people, fight for their cause, share their troubles and miseries, and they will not fail you. This is the way to strengthen the Party and the success of our programme. Hence if you believe in the fundamentals of your Party, in the efficacy of its programme and policy, stand on your own legs. Therefore, I appeal to you to withdraw all the amendments that have been moved.

B. C. Verghese (Travancore-Cochin) : I support the amendment. India is a vast country. Different provincial branches have to face different problems. In many provinces our main contest is with the Congress, which is today the ruling party all over India. But there may be provinces in which the Communist strength cannot be ignored. In such places we might find ourselves between two strong parties : the Congress and the Communists. The situation here would be rather desperate for us. If we do not enter into an electoral adjustment with any one of them we would run the risk of being wiped out from the political scene. Having once been wiped out it may not be an easy job to revive the Party in these areas. I would therefore plead with you to look at the problem from all angles. It may not be possible for us to fight both the Congress and the Communists simultaneously in a few areas. I do not understand why we should not enter into some sort of understanding with other parties and thus secure our position. It will not mean any support to communist ideology. It is a practical question. We cannot possibly contest all the constituencies. We can therefore have an arrangement with others without surrendering any real position.

As I have said earlier, circumstances differ in different provinces. It would therefore be advisable to leave it to the National Executive to take decisions in these matters in accordance with the needs of the situation. We certainly can trust our National Executive to this extent. If we do not trust them, whom else can we trust?

V. K. Kobra (Hyderabad) : I think all of us have confidence in ourselves and in the Party. We can stand on our own legs. This Conference itself is a proof of that. I think we can be trusted to look after the interests of the Party. But we have to realise that the South has problems different from that of the North. In the South, Communist menace is relatively more serious than in the North. We have to be thoroughly practical in tackling these issues and cannot afford to bind ourselves to any particular line of action in advance in these questions of strategy. The evil of equidistance must now be buried down for good. Politics is not mathematics. I do not know why we cannot have full confidence in our National Executive. We should not be afraid of alliances. Alliance at the time of elections does not mean a permanent alliance. Nothing will be lost if we enter into an understanding with some parties not to contest against one another in certain constituencies. While deciding this issue, let us clearly understand that if we bind ourselves in this fashion here it might mean winding up the Party in certain areas, where we will not be able to strike deep roots again.

Ajit Roy (West Bengal) : I support the amendment. I can well appreciate the reason why this sentence has been put in the Policy Statement. The Party entered into electoral adjustments and alliances with other parties at some places in the

past and they tended to degenerate into political alliances. The experience has not been very encouraging. But we have to take concrete realities into consideration. In West Bengal, for instance, we are facing a situation that is very akin to the one prevailing in Andhra. The Congress is steadily increasing its support from the middle classes as well as from a section of the peasantry. People, who were dead against the Congress in the recent past, are gradually turning in its favour. The old Socialist Party was routed even in the last elections. That happened not because the Congress was very strong but because wherever we put up candidates we were opposed by the Congress as well as other political parties. Had we entered into an understanding with other parties we could have captured a few seats. The position in the coming elections would be even more difficult. We cannot ignore the realities. It is not at all a question of principles but entirely one of tactics. I do not think we stand to lose in any way by getting a few seats in the legislatures. If we take up our parliamentary work seriously, this amendment should be carried.

Peter Alvares (Bombay City) : I rise to oppose the amendment for the simple reason that it will be a source of constant temptation to the Party to enter into alliances with all sorts of parties under all circumstances. It would become impossible to check it. It will expose us to the danger of becoming merely a parliamentary party. All our energies would tend to be devoted to adjustments and alliances. Real party work, work of spreading the ideology of the Party and developing socialist consciousness in the toiling masses by means of hard and sustained work would be relegated to the background. It will tend to change the entire character of our Party. I do not relish this prospect.

Again, we know from our experience that adjustments turn into virtual alliances. It does not stop at avoiding triangular contests. It automatically, and inevitably, develops into a regular alliance in all constituencies. And at that time you can do nothing to stop it.

Let us, therefore, not think in terms of adjustments and alliances. We can very well contest in a limited number of constituencies and concentrate all our energies and resources there. We should contest only where our candidates can at least give a good fight and have fair chances of being returned. But do not think of alliances and adjustments. It will create such confusion that we shall be helpless before it.

I admit there are certain areas which need special attention and consideration. Their cases can be considered at the appropriate time. We can do something at that time to help them out of the difficulty. But why drag the entire Party into this bog?

Mahamaya Prasad Sinha (Bihar) : Perhaps you will be surprised to find a member of the National Executive supporting this amendment. But there is nothing to be surprised in it.

Even at the Lucknow meeting of the National Executive, I might tell you, a majority of the members were in favour of the deletion of this sentence. But, in spite of it, the decision not to recommend its deletion was taken. Let us however not go into these details. I am certain that if Acharya Narendra Deva had been present here he would have accepted this amendment.

Apart from it, I am definitely of the opinion that without this amendment we shall not be able to make appreciable progress even in Bihar. I can say from personal experience that the general sentiment of the people at large is in favour of electoral adjustments among the opposition parties. I have put you one straight question. Do we or do we not want to defeat the Congress and replace it? If we do want to defeat it and replace it I do not know how we can do it except by joining hands with other parties that are fighting the Congress. I do not think that an electoral alliance even with the Communists would be injurious to our cause. I have faith in myself, my Party and my ideology. Why should our friends feel so shaky about it? Communists cannot swallow us.

Triloki Singh (Uttar Pradesh) : I stand here to support the amendment. I know it will surprise you to find the General Secretary supporting an amendment to the Policy Statement presented to you on behalf of the National Executive. But this is a democratic party and I want to place my honest opinion before you.

Farid Ansari referred to an alleged alliance with the Communists in the Lucknow parliamentary by-election in which I was the Party candidate. I can emphatically say that I never entered into an alliance with the Communists. On the other hand, I rejected an offer made by the Communists. Let there be no doubt about it.

That, however, was a matter of personal explanation.

We are an opposition party. This Policy Statement makes that very clear. We cannot, therefore, have any adjustment or understanding with the Congress which has to be defeated and replaced. But we might have to make adjustments with other parties. We are today adopting a Policy Statement. While doing it we have to pay due attention to practical difficulties. These are matters of strategy and can be easily, and with advantage, left to the National Executive, or, if necessary, to the General Council. I press for it also because I feel such passages prove fertile ground for breeding confusion and misunderstandings. If a friend and a colleague like Farid Ansari can misunderstand me, who will be free from it? I would therefore urge you to delete this controversial sentence from the Policy Statement.

Purshottam Trikamdas (Bombay City) : I oppose this amendment. After having adopted the Policy Statement in general we cannot go about changing its structure in this fashion. I will be true to the spirit of this document and would not like to enter into any kind of adjustment with any party under any circum-

stances. Let us understand it clearly. If you pass this amendment, it will amount to sanctioning alliance with the Communists and none else. As we stand today the question of having adjustments with the Congress or the communalists does not arise. The only party that remains in the field is the Communist Party. By adopting this amendment we will be throwing our gates wide open for their infiltration. I am sure that an alliance with the Communists would eat away our Party. I would therefore strongly urge you to defeat this amendment.

The Chairman then called for votes, and after having counted the number of hands raised for and against the amendment, declared the amendment lost.

Some delegates however pressed for division. The Chairman agreed to the demand and the delegates divided themselves into two parts. A proper count revealed the following figures :

For the Amendment	182
Against the Amendment	269

The amendment was lost by majority.

Chairman : Let us move on to the next amendment. Samar Guha will move it.

Samar Guha (West Bengal) : My amendment is to delete the words *The Communist Party or any communal party* after *Congress* in the last sentence of Chapter VII.

This amendment is different from the one we have just disposed of. The previous amendment sought to delete the whole sentence thus leaving the door open even for an adjustment with the Congress. This amendment specifically bars it. Our main fight is against the Congress and we cannot think of having any adjustment with it. But we cannot preclude the other opposition parties. Adjustment with other political parties might be necessary to build up a strong opposition to the Congress. Our Political Resolution has made it clear that in the coming General Elections we have to fight, not for capturing power, but for the purpose of building up an effective opposition. But, how are we going to play that role ? We cannot hope to do it single-handed. We will have to seek adjustment with other parties. There is no way out. All that we may need is merely an electoral adjustment and not a united front. With electoral adjustments we may hope to get more seats in West Bengal than would be the case if we had no electoral adjustment with other parties. If we do not leave room for electoral adjustment with other opposition parties, we may have to repent for our wrong step in future.

H.V. Kamath (Madhya Pradesh) : The amendment before you serves to emphasise the essential aspect of the PSP: its role

of an opposition party. In order to be able to play this role well, it may be necessary sometimes to enter into electoral adjustments with other parties. Not that we must always do it. But we cannot, at the same time, rule out the possibility altogether. I do not think we can in any way suffer because of it. On the other hand we have everything to gain by it. I do not hesitate to tell you that on your decision depends the fate of the new Kerala State. Calculations are that no party will be able to form a government there by itself. What shall we do there? We shall not be able to play our part or be on the political scene if we do not adopt this amendment. The Allahabad Policy Statement clearly mentioned that the PSP could enter into an electoral alliance or adjustment with political parties opposing the ruling party. I do not see any reason why we should reverse this policy at this stage. Let us learn something from our past experience. In most cases we lost only because the Congress was opposed by more than one candidate, thus splitting the opposition vote and in several straight fights we defeated the Congress.

Purshottam Trikamdas (Bombay City): My fears have come true. This amendment seeks to ban any adjustment with the Congress, allowing free scope for adjustments with the Communists and the communalists. I am amazed at this. We have nothing in common with the Communists and the communalists, while we have at least something in common with the Congress. It is a democratic party. This amendment seeks to ban any understanding with a democratic party but opens the door for adjustments and alliances with non-democratic, even anti-democratic, parties. I do not understand the logic of it. I oppose it strongly.

The amendment was then put to vote. Some delegates pressed for division. The Chairman asked the delegates to separate themselves into two sections. The result of the poll was :

For the Amendment	189
Against the Amendment	260

The amendment was declared lost.

The amendment seeking to substitute the word *adjustment* by *alliance* in the last but one line of Chapter VII was lost by majority.

The amendment seeking to add the words *without going into coalition* after the words *programme* in the 9th line of the last para of chapter VII was also lost by majority.

Karpoori Thakur moved an amendment seeking to substitute the sentence: *The question whether such an emergency exists shall be determined by the National Executive, such a decision is to be ratified by the General Council* in the last paragraph of chapter VII

by *The question whether such an emergency exists will be decided by a Special National Conference*. The amendment, when put to vote, was lost by majority.

Sibnath Banerji (West Bengal) moved an amendment seeking to substitute the sentence: *The question whether such an emergency exists shall be determined by the National Executive, such a decision is to be ratified by the General Council* in the last paragraph of chapter VII by *The question whether such an emergency exists shall be determined by the General Council*. The amendment was lost by majority.

The House then agreed to refer other amendments received by the Chairman to Acharya Narendra Deva for his consideration. The House also agreed to authorise the National Executive to publish the Policy Statement as amended by Acharya Narendra Deva.

RESOLUTION ON INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

The Chairman : We shall now take up the resolution on international situation. Somprakash Shaida will move it.

Somprakash Shaida (Punjab) : I will not speak much on the resolution. There is nothing particularly new in it as, basically, it is a reiteration of our well-known policy of active neutrality and non-involvement in bloc politics.

There has been no basic change in the international scene since we met last. There may have been some improvement in the situation here and there and the cold war may not be as apparent as before. But that does not alter the position materially. The world continues to be divided into two power blocs who continue to make ceaseless efforts to draw unattached countries into their fold. The failure of the Geneva meeting of the Big Four Foreign Ministers has revived the cold war which now threatens to penetrate into new areas. Nowadays we hear a lot about the need to give aid to the world's underdeveloped countries and the need to liquidate imperialism and colonialism from Asia and Africa. But this clamour, now growing more insistent, is due to a desire on the part of the big powers to exploit for their own ends the genuine aspirations of the people groaning under the heels of colonialism. One really wonders why these advocates of colonial freedom do not make any effort to eradicate it in their own homes. Mutual aid and colonial freedom have thus become pawns in the hands of these big powers who are out to establish their domination over the entire world. Even the noble principles of the Panch Shila and the Warsaw Pact go hand in hand. The Baghdad Pact, SEATO and the Dulles-Cunha statement are the practical manifestations of politics of negotiating peace from positions of strength. These developments only serve to convince us that no basic change in our policy is called for. I am therefore sure you would give this resolution your unanimous support.

B. C. Verghese (Travancore-Cochin) : I rise to support the resolution. It is comprehensive and self-explanatory. The foreign policy of a country like India has to serve two purposes, (1) of promoting peace in the world and (2) of safeguarding our national interests in the international sphere. If we judge the Government of India's foreign policy in this context we find that while it has dismally failed in the second, it suffers from a serious defect in regard to the first. You will find Nehru supporting Russian moves and hobnobbing with the Soviets in certain spheres. On the other hand, he also supports the Atlantic Bloc in some ways. Thus he alternately serves the two blocs. This policy cannot be fruitful in the long run. It cannot consolidate the area of peace, as he calls it, and has not been able to prevent the unattached countries from falling into the clutches of either of the two blocs.

We also find Nehru helpless in solving the specific problems of colonialism and military alliances outside the UNO. Portugal is still in possession of Goa, Daman and Diu and Nehru has not been able to do anything to stamp out colonialism from India. Putting his faith solely in diplomatic pressure he has gone out of his way to stop the mass satyagraha of unarmed Indians to secure liberation of these foreign pockets. The problems of Kashmir and of inhuman treatment meted out to Indians in South Africa are no nearer solution. Nor has he been able to do anything to stop the Warsaw and Baghdad Pacts and the SEATO Agreement from being signed. How is his foreign policy a success then?

This leaves us in no doubt that only a policy of active neutrality in international conflicts and non-involvement in bloc politics can serve the general interests of India in the present international situation.

Samar Guha (West Bengal) : I have a few amendments, not of a vital nature, and I hope the mover would accept them. They are : (1) para 4, line 6, substitute the word *rejected* by *dissolved*; (2) para 5, add after *atomic weapons but . . .* the words *open and free exchange of all atomic knowledge among the different nations of the world*; (3) replace the next sentence beginning with the words *substantial reduction* and ending with the words *armaments also by progressive reduction of conventional armaments with a view to bring about complete disarmament as early as possible*.

Purshottam Trikamdas (Bombay City) : I also have a few amendments :

- (1) para 3, substitute the second and third sentences in para 3 by the following : *The exercise of the veto has been a hindrance to the democratic functioning of the U. N. but its elimination is only possible if greater international understanding is brought about by creating a genuine atmosphere of peace.*
- (2) para 8, second sentence, delete the words *not only*.

- (3) para 8, second sentence, delete the words *but also of its utter lack of faith in the non-violent weapon of satyagraha as a means for the solution of international disputes.*

I think the veto has got to be retained if the UNO has to function properly. If the veto is removed, the countries of the Soviet Bloc would be outvoted on all important issues and the USA would be supreme in the UNO. I am sure you do not suspect me of having any leanings for the Soviet Union or the ideology it stands for. But, if we are practical, we have to answer one question. Do we or do we not want the UNO to exist and function? This question has to be answered because we must understand that removal of the veto means either winding up the UNO or reducing it to a one-bloc affair. I am not for veto. As a democrat I cannot be. But given the world as it is, you cannot remove it without crippling the UNO.

As far as the problem of Goa is concerned, let me state at the outset that I fully subscribe to the non-violent approach. But non-violence cannot be equated with *satyagraha*. Non-violent *satyagraha* has its limitations and we must understand them. I do not believe that Goa could be liberated by means of *satyagraha*. *Satyagraha* could have some meaning if the Government of India were ready to intervene in an effective manner in order to prevent the non-violent *satyagrahis* from being ill-treated and tortured by the Portuguese. But, as it is, the Government of India refuses to do any such thing. Under these circumstances *satyagraha* has no meaning.

Somprakash Shaida (Punjab) : Replying to the debate, he said : I have no objection to accepting Samar Guha's amendments. But I am rather surprised and pained at the amendments tabled by Purshottam Trikamdas. They are contrary to the Policy Statement already adopted by us. We believe in the UNO. We have said so in our Policy Statement. We want it to continue and make progress. But to do that it must not, in the first place, put any restrictions on entry of any sovereign state and, secondly, it should remove the veto. Why should five countries in the world have such overriding powers? Why should, after all, there be such discrimination? And we, socialists, who stand for the removal of all such discrimination, why should we feel shy of asking for its removal? We are not there to protect or preserve the world as it is. We want to change it, and change it in the direction of more democracy and equality, not only on the national level but also in the international sphere. I do not agree that the time is not yet ripe for the removal of the veto.

Goa is a part and parcel of India and must belong to it. But how do we secure it? Through violence? No. We have already abjured that. Then what is the alternative? The only non-violent approach is that of mass *satyagraha*, the weapon with which we fought and drove out the Britishers

from our land. But the Government of India seems to be afraid of mobilising the people. It has no use for it. It is afraid because, once mobilised, the people may also refuse to depend on Shri Nehru in internal affairs as well. We, the democratic socialists, on the other hand, firmly believe in the masses and have nothing to be afraid of them. Mass satyagraha can move mountains and we can give it up only at our peril.

I cannot accept Purshottam Trikamdas's amendments and would urge you to reject them.

When put to vote, all the amendments tabled by Purshottam Trikamdas were rejected.

Samar Guha's amendments were accepted by the mover as well as by the delegates.

The resolution as amended was carried by an overwhelming majority. (See Appendix C for resolution).

The Conference then adjourned.

FRIDAY—DECEMBER 30, 1955

AFTERNOON—DELEGATES SESSION

The Conference reassembled at 2-30 p.m.

RESOLUTION ON KISAN

Karpoori Thakur (Bihar) moved the resolution on Kisan. No speeches were made on this resolution.

The Chairman then put the resolution to vote and it was passed unanimously. (See Appendix C for resolution).

RESOLUTION ON CYCLONES

After the adoption of the Kisan resolution the resolution on floods and cyclones was moved from the Chair and adopted unanimously. (See Appendix C for resolution).

RESOLUTION ON LABOUR

S. M. Joshi (Maharashtra): Moving the resolution on Labour S. M. Joshi said: I think you would have studied the resolution. In the first paragraph of this resolution it has been said that the Labour Movement is in the transitional period,

In view of the experience and developments in the past we feel that our Labour movement is passing through a transitional period. There is more or less a stalemate in the movement. Firstly, the Congress Government's laws for Labour have not given any benefit to labour; on the contrary, they are detrimental to their interest. Besides, these laws have paved the way for litigation. Further, the labour laws are used to strengthen the INTUC. Where independent Labour movement was existing, and the unions were strong, the authorities used their power to kill the consciousness of the workers. You will be surprised to know that in one place in Maharashtra no meetings of the trade unions could be held during the last year. This centre was very active and conscious. But when the Union was captured by the INTUC this condition was created. The Second Five Year plan is before us; you are aware that the promises made in the past have not been fulfilled. They will not be fulfilled even now. Nothing concrete could be expected from the Government of India.

You know due to economic difficulties people leave their villages and go to cities to seek employment in the big factories, where there are no arrangements for housing them. The industrial labour legislations are not implemented. A living example of this can be seen in the case of the Bank Employees' dispute. You will also see that no definite security is offered to the labourers in the public sector of the industries. When strikes occur, the Government generally says that they are resorted to for political reasons. These disputes are not referred even to Labour Tribunals. In the Defence Workers Unions, because the members are government servants, their ordinary labour rights are considerably curtailed.

The Pay Commission Award also was not given effect to in full by the Government. Pay scales today are the same as existed in 1947. The salaries of low-paid staff are too meagre, while those of officers are very high, thus resulting in great disparity. Hence we demand appointment of another Pay Commission for the revision of pay scales and grades. The proposal to take directors from Labour is not so bright as it appears. One or two of these directors are won over by the capitalists or their voices are drowned. Even in Works Committees we have to face troubles from officers, and sometimes have to fall in line with these officers. There is no doubt that for achieving its legitimate rights Labour shall have to strengthen itself. Thus alone can the challenge of the Government be met.

At present Labour is after gaining economic ends in the trade unions, leaving aside political gains. This is not beneficial at all. I think Labour must take into consideration the political and social ideas side by side with the economic aspect of the Indian situation. They must have political objectives also.

Along with service to the society Labour must raise the tone and temper of the movement and infuse moral awareness, so

that the socialist movement in the country is interlinked with the struggle of different sections of exploited classes into a big revolutionary movement for changing the entire social order.

A. Subramaniam (Tamilnad) : Seconding the resolution on Labour he said : S. M. Joshi has already explained the resolutions fully. Therefore, I do not think it is necessary for me to say much. Trade union work is very important and of vital importance, but I have to confess that for the past few years, Party workers all over the country have not been paying much attention to it. The labour policy of the government is that of siding with the capitalists and perpetuating the exploitation of labour. The INTUC has been poisoning the labour movement ever since 1947, and unless something is done the trade union movement itself will be destroyed. The Government is allowing the employers to suppress the workers in every possible manner. The policy of the Government to entangle Labour in fruitless litigations has to be stopped immediately. This is only possible if Labour becomes conscious of its problems and strengthens its organisation.

Vedanta Hemmiga (Mysore) : You might be aware of electricity workers' strike in Mysore. But you perhaps do not know that the Congress Government broke that strike and suppressed the workers. Lots of money, nearly 12 lakhs, was wasted by the Government to break that strike. Labour was employed for guarding the electric poles, but the Government never cared to concede the genuine demands of the workers.

The Chairman announced that several amendments had been received.

D. D. Vasisht (Delhi) moved an amendment that para 8 should begin with the following :

“The Conference directs all Party workers not to hold any office in the central organisations (or their branches) other than the Hind Mazdoor Sabha.”

Mithilesh Sinha (Bihar) supported the amendment of Vasisht.

Sibnath Banerji (West Bengal) : I think the amendment proposed by our friends should have come from the National Executive as they were well aware of the circumstances and the situation. The amendment should be accepted by the mover.

Gour Mohan Ghorai (West Bengal) : Add in the last line of the last paragraph the following :

This Conference, therefore, directs all the members of the PSP to strengthen and revitalise the Hind Mazdoor Sabha.

The amendment was accepted by S. M. Joshi and the House.

B. N. Rajbans (Maharashtra) moved an amendment for removing para 7 of the resolution. It was accepted by the mover.

Mithilesh Sinha (Bihar) moved an amendment that after the second para, the following be added :

The Government lacks any policy regarding recognition of unions. Even where they have some rules in this connection they are manipulated to help spread of INTUC only. Repeated representations by genuine labour organisations for plebiscite to determine the representative character of unions, in cases where they are more than one, are not at all attended to and in public sectors also the Government adopts a policy of encouraging INTUC against the wishes of the workers. This Conference demands that the Industrial Disputes Act should be so amended that the question of recognition of unions be taken as an industrial dispute and also provision be made for plebiscite to determine the representative character of unions in case of any dispute between two unions.

The amendment was accepted by the mover.

Brajkishore Shastri (Uttar Pradesh) : Add the following to the last para of the resolution :

This Conference directs the National Executive to chalk out a programme for trade union workers and to appoint a committee to control and co-ordinate the work of trade union workers.

The amendment was accepted by the mover.

S. M. Joshi (Maharashtra) : I have full sympathy with the amendment moved by Vasisht, but there is this difficulty before the National Executive. After the merger of the KMPP and the Socialist Party we found that various members of the KMPP were active members of the INTUC and under the circumstances we could not meet the situation. I know that in Bengal the situation is serious and a resolution was passed in the Bengal PSP asking Party workers to withdraw from INTUC unions. I understand that there was a lot of hue and cry and even resignations were threatened in case the implementation of the said resolution was resorted to. Under the circumstances the resolution was not implemented. I think our leaders should have clearly told such workers that they were not afraid of such resignations, and that participation in the INTUC was against the interests of the Party. The Bengal Party should have acted more vigorously. But that was not

done. I can appreciate their difficulties and that is just the reason why this point has not been incorporated in this resolution.

I think the suggestion should have come from the various provinces. I would now suggest that the matter be referred to the New National Executive for further consideration. In my opinion, we can continue for a few more days like this and allow the National Executive to take this important policy decision after careful consideration.

Even though I am in complete sympathy with the amendment, I would request the mover to withdraw it for the above reasons. The House is however sovereign to decide in any manner it likes.

The amendment was then put to vote and was carried by majority.

The resolution as amended was then put to vote and passed. (See Appendix C).

ELECTION OF THE NEW EXECUTIVE

The Chairman : We have now come to the last item on our agenda—election of the new office-bearers and the National Executive. According to our constitution we have to elect a Chairman, a General Secretary and members of the National Executive who shall not be more than 23 or less than 15. A Deputy Chairman, a Treasurer and not more than three Joint Secretaries have to be elected by the National Executive and we need not bother about these here.

Let us first elect our Chairman. Allow me to propose the name of Acharya Narendra Deva, our outgoing Chairman, for this exalted office. He is not here with us today physically. He has not been keeping well for some months. Fortunately he is recovering fast. We need him at the helm of our affairs as much as we did at Nagpur. He can pilot the Party best as has been proved during the past few critical months in our life. He has given us a Policy Statement which has evoked such enthusiasm among Party workers. I have therefore great pleasure in proposing his name for the Chairmanship.

Mahmaya Prasad Sinha (Bihar) seconded it.

No other name was proposed, and Acharya Narendra Deva was re-elected Chairman unanimously amidst tumultuous applause.

The Chairman : I would now call for names for the General Secretaryship.

S. M. Joshi : I have great pleasure in proposing the name of

Triloki Singh for the General Secretaryship of the Party. He has been our General Secretary during this critical period and has discharged his functions with distinction.

H. V. Kamath, seconding this proposal, paid glowing tributes to Triloki Singh.

The Chairman : Is there any other name?

No other name was proposed and Triloki Singh was declared elected General Secretary of the Party unanimously amidst thunderous applause.

The Chairman : Now we come to the members of the National Executive. How many shall they be? I suppose 23.

The House unanimously agreed that 23 members should be elected.

The Chairman then invited names. The following names were proposed by various delegates.

1. Prafulla Chandra Ghosh	West Bengal
2. Sarangdhar Das	Utkal
3. Asoka Mehta	Bombay City
4. Sucheta Kripalani	Delhi
5. Ganga Sharan Sinha	Bihar
6. S. M. Joshi	Maharashtra
7. Pattom Thanu Pillai	Travancore-Cochin
8. K. B. Menon	Malabar
9. N. Venkat Rao	Andhra
10. K. R. Karanth	South Kanara
11. Chinnadurai	Tamilnad
12. H. V. Kamath	Madhya Pradesh
13. Tilakraj Chadha	Punjab
14. Surendranath Dwivedy	Utkal
15. V. S. Dandekar	Madhya Pradesh
16. Prof. Raja Ram Shastri	Uttar Pradesh
17. Mahmaya Prasad Sinha	Bihar
18. Basawan Sinha	Bihar
19. Hareshwar Goswami	Assam
20. M. R. Dandavate	Bombay City
21. Farid Ansari	Uttar Pradesh
22. Prem Bhasin	Punjab
23. Suresh Chandra Banerji	West Bengal
24. Dr. Jaswant Mehta	Saurashtra
25. Peter Alvares	Bombay City
26. Suresh Desai	Gujarat
27. Sibanath Banerji	West Bengal
28. Purshottam Trikamdas	Bombay City
29. B. C. Verghese	Travancore-Cochin

30. Nooh Abbasi	Hyderabad
31. Banka Bihari Das	Utkal
32. Ajit Roy	West Bengal
33. Madhav Reddy	Hyderabad
34. Karpoori Thakur	Bihar
35. Niranjana Singh	Madhya Pradesh
36. M. S. Gokhale	Madhya Pradesh
37. Ramamurthy Naidu	Hyderabad
38. Ganga Sahai Chaturvedi	Uttar Pradesh
39. Manzoor Ahsan Azazi	Bihar

The following names were withdrawn : Jaswant Mehta, Purshottam Trikamdas, Banka Bihari Das, Madhav Reddy, Karpoori Thakur, Niranjana Singh.

The Chairman : 39 names were proposed. Six names have been withdrawn. That leaves 33 in the field. Out of these 33 we have to elect 23 members to the National Executive. We have, therefore, to take votes. The system of voting is multiple distributive, that is, every delegate present here has 23 votes, but he cannot give more than one vote to one candidate. The office would now get the ballot papers cyclostyled which would be distributed to all delegates against their cards. I would, however, caution you against one thing. You have to vote for 23 candidates, neither more nor less. Any ballot paper containing more or less than 23 votes would be declared invalid.

I appoint Triloki Singh to conduct the elections and act as the Returning Officer. He would be assisted in his work by S. M. Joshi, A. Subramaniam, Prem Bhasin, M. R. Dandavate and Basanta Chandra Ghosh. Triloki Singh would declare the result when the counting is over.

We are now at the very end of our labours. Allow me, in conclusion, to thank you all sincerely for the willing co-operation you gave me in conducting the proceedings of this Conference. You have all been very kind to me. But for your kindness and forbearance it would have been impossible for me to discharge my duties.

I have no hesitation in saying that this has been a historic conference, a landmark in the history of our Party. The most important achievement of this Conference has no doubt been the adoption of the Policy Statement which has given the Party a new start and an inspiring message. With this message we can now go to the people and engage ourselves in the arduous task of building up a genuine party of democratic socialism in this ancient country. This Conference has demonstrated that we don't lack in anything. The number of delegates and member visitors who have flocked here from all corners of India at the cost of so much expense and discomfort has been a very pleasant surprise to me. I am proud of the fact that our Party is the Party of the young. The tone and level of the debates held here would compare with any such debates held elsewhere. I leave Gaya with

confidence in the future of the Praja Socialist Party and in your selfless devotion to the cause of democratic socialism.

Triloki Singh : It is not out of mere duty that I rise to thank the Chairman of this Conference, K. R. Karanth, and congratulate him on his singular ability in conducting the deliberations of this Conference. His mature wisdom, tactfulness and sympathetic understanding of the point of view of the delegates were, above all, responsible for the orderly and democratic spirit in which the deliberations took place. We were indeed fortunate in having him in the Chair.

The delegates, who have gathered here in such large numbers from the four corners of this vast land, deserve no less credit for the success of this Conference. The debates were carried on with zeal and vehemence but they were not in the least acrimonious. We have thus laid healthy and genuinely democratic traditions here, something quite different from some of the debates held at previous conferences.

I am sure I speak for all of you when I pay my thanks to the Bihar comrades for the wonderful arrangements they made for us at such a short notice. They spared nothing to make our stay here comfortable. This is the first time perhaps when such variety of food was available—from Tandoori Roti to Rasam and Sambhar Bhat. I sometimes wondered how they managed to keep so courteous to all the delegates, without distinction, in the midst of such stress and strain. I thank them all, once again, very sincerely on behalf of the Central Office and all of you present here.

Mahmaya Prasad Sinha (Bihar) : I subscribe to every word that Triloki Singh has said about K. R. Karanth, our Chairman. His cool temper and levelheadedness, frankness and impartially have set a model for all when occasion calls to perform such responsible and onerous tasks. I thank him and congratulate him not only on behalf of Bihar comrades but, with your permission, on behalf of all the delegates and member visitors who participated in this conference.

To the delegates I would only say that they should forgive us for any inconvenience caused to them during their stay here. I can however assure them they did not suffer from any avoidable inconvenience. We of the Bihar Branch of the Party are grateful for your co-operation and helpful and understanding attitude without which we could not have worked for a single day. We are also grateful for the kind sentiments expressed by the General Secretary about us.

We have done much useful work here. We have had debates and discussions, sometimes heated, often spirited. We are going back inspired with the message of democratic socialism which would now be our mission to spread to every village in this vast land.

I would be failing in my duty if I do not put on record our

deep appreciation of the sympathetic role and co-operation of the press. All pressmen here have been more than fair to us. I thank them once again.

The mainstay of all our management here have of course been the volunteers who had to bear the brunt of such hard work. They braved the cold weather at all odd hours and did not shirk the most unpleasant job. Always cheerful and willing to be helpful to our guests, their unruffled tempers have been the greatest asset to all of us. They worked in the true pioneering spirit of socialism and have proved that we are capable of sticking to our monotonous jobs in the midst of exciting debates. I thank them all most sincerely.

Farid Ansari (Uttar Pradesh) : Your conscience must be telling you that the Gaya Session of our National Conference has been a historic one. 600 delegates and 1,000 member visitors came here from distant places to put their seal on the Policy Statement that will serve as a beacon light to all of us.

You are aware that an attempt was made to disrupt our Party. It was your loyalty to the Party, as the spearhead of the socialist movement in India, and your devotion to the cause of socialism that foiled this conspiracy. You have saved the Party. Not only that but the PSP today is stronger than ever.

One thing more. Our Chairman, Acharya Narendra Deva—one of the great socialist thinkers of India—in spite of his serious illness left his sick-bed and toured Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Delhi. He met the workers and other Party members, apprised them of the real situation, removed the confusion in our rank and file and thus saved the Party from destruction. When the Uttar Pradesh Executive openly defied the mandate of the Party Acharyaji told me : “Now I must leave my sick-bed and put an end to this defiance before it spreads. Even if I die I must save the Party.” He visited Banaras, Ghazipur, Patna and Lucknow in this connection, addressed not only Party workers but huge public meetings. Acharyaji’s undaunted efforts saved the Party. His weak health and frail body could not bear that mental and physical strain. Since then he has been ailing. Let all of us pay our respects to that great man who has not only saved the Party but has presented a remarkable document that indicates what the PSP stands for and what it wants to achieve. Let us all pray for his speedy recovery so that he may lead us to the destined goal of establishing socialism in India.

The ballot papers were now ready and were distributed to all delegates against their cards. Filled-in ballot papers were collected by Triloki Singh and his associates appointed by the Chairman for this purpose. The counting went on till about midnight when the result was declared by Triloki Singh. The following 23 candidates were declared elected to the National Executive.

Ajit Roy	Dr. K. B. Menon
Asoka Mehta	Pattom Thanu Pillai
P. S. Chinnadurai	Peter Alvares
M. R. Dandavate	Dr. Prafulla Chandra Ghosh
V. S. Dandekar	Prem Bhasin
Farid Ansari	Prof. Raja Ram Shastri
Ganga Saran Sinha	Sarangdhar Das
Hareshwar Goswami	Sucheta Kripalani
S. M. Joshi	Surendranath Dwivedy
H. V. Kamath	Tilakraj Chadha
K. R. Karanth	N. Venkatrao
Mahmaya Prasad Sinha	

The Second National Conference of the Praja Socialist Party then concluded its five day session.

APPENDICES

CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS

We are meeting today under the shadow of a domestic calamity. There has been a split in the Party and our ranks have been thinned to a certain extent in consequence. It is not my intention to elaborate this unhappy theme in my Address and to tell you in detail the story of the split. As a matter of fact, most of you are already familiar with it. I can only say that my conscience is clear in this matter and what I did was done in the best interest of the Party. You already know that we are in no way responsible for this unfortunate episode and that the blame must be laid at the door of others. Of course, I could not remain a passive spectator when I found that a signal had been given to all the Party units in U.P. to defy the authority of the National Executive. I would have failed in my duty and proved myself unworthy of the trust reposed in me if I had not taken action to check the growth of indiscipline in our ranks. If it had been the case of a lapse of a few individuals I could have overlooked it. But I found that there was a calculated move by a small group to capture the Party by disruptionist tactics or to break it if these tactics did not succeed. But I assure you that I did not act in a hurry. I patiently waited for two months in the vain hope that our friends would see the light of reason and retrace their steps. But when the National Executive found that they neither listened to the voice of reason nor to the pressure of provincial workers who were in an overwhelming majority against acts of indiscipline, it was left with no choice in the matter and had to take action reluctantly.

There are certain comrades who take a narrow view of the whole question. They admit that the constitutional position of the National Executive is quite correct, but they doubt the wisdom of the action simply because they find that it has ultimately led to a split. But the question of discipline is a fundamental question. Rules of conduct framed to regulate the conduct of members of a political party are not to be treated like moral precepts enjoined in religious books, whose observance is meritorious but whose infringement does not involve any punishment. It is also not a case where discipline is imposed by an outside authority. The members of the Party have by their free will bound themselves by the Code of Conduct. It is the only way in which an organisation can be held together.

I assure you that if no action had been taken, indiscipline would have spread like wild fire and the prestige of the Party would have irrevocably suffered. No one is more sorry than my-

self for this unfortunate episode. But there is no use in lamenting over the past, when we know that we could in no way prevent it from occurring. We should take consolation in the thought that by and large our comrades have recognised the value of discipline and have affirmed their loyalty to the Party. There are ups and downs in the life of every organisation. The Congress suffered from a split in 1906, its fortunes were at the lowest ebb at certain periods of its history, but it overcame all obstacles, rose again and became much stronger than before.

We should neither give way to despair nor indulge in mutual recrimination. We should set down to work in all earnestness and make good the loss by acting with redoubled vigour. Great tasks await us and we shall be unworthy of the cause we espouse, if we give way to pessimism and relapse into inactivity. As a matter of fact, tasks of two epochs have devolved upon us. Political freedom has come to us too late in the day in an epoch when the national sentiment has been subdued by democratic socialism. It is good in a sense because nationalism will not be allowed to run into excess.

Caste is a very old institution. It has survived many social revolutions and its vitality is amazing. The economic and social changes that are taking place are weakening it, but the process is rather slow. As a matter of fact, because the purpose and meaning of Swaraj is not made sufficiently clear to our people, caste feelings are tending to be strengthened since the advent of freedom. The caste system is an anachronism in the modern age. It militates against both democracy and nationalism. We of the present generation must, therefore, strengthen the national spirit which alone can check the evils of communalism and casteism. We must strive for not only a classless but also a casteless society. The national spirit must be sedulously cultivated. For the establishment of national unity the process of assimilation should be accelerated. It is necessary to have a common symbol and common objectives so that persons of different castes and communities may feel their oneness. A common language, a common code of civil laws, a common dress and observance of certain common festivals will go a long way to strengthen national unity. Above all, certain common objectives in which all communities are equally interested should be placed in the forefront for the realisation of which they may work in close co-operation with each other.

All differences cannot be eliminated, nor is it necessary or desirable to do so. People passionately cling to their religious beliefs and cultural forms. We should not interfere with them, with this proviso that uncivilised and immoral customs and practices cannot be tolerated even though the name of religion may be invoked in their defence. But the same economic and legal systems should be established all over the country. Laws of inheritance, succession and marriage have been revised for the Hindus. It would have been better, if we had made these laws for all religious

communities, with the proviso that for the present they would not apply to Muslims and Christians. The tribal people would, of course, for a long time have to be treated on a different basis.

Hindi has been adopted as the national language, not because its literature is richer than that of other Indian languages, nor because it represents a superior culture, but because its territorial jurisdiction is much wider than those of others. Its spread is also being promoted by Muslim settlers in other states, by Hindi speaking labourers who have migrated to other parts of India for earning their livelihood, and by Hindi pictures. But the promoters of Hindi should always bear in mind that they are not to wound others' sentiments by thoughtless utterances. Hindi cannot be forced on those who are unwilling today to accept it. The task has to be approached in all humility. It must be remembered that the cause of Hindi can be promoted only by gentle methods and not by the exhibition of domineering spirit.

An equally important reform is the adoption of a common script. All want that an educated Indian of today should know more than one Indian language but it will more or less remain a pious wish so long as there is a multiplicity of scripts. If we adopt a common script, one whose mother tongue is Hindi can learn at least North Indian languages in the course of a few months. Some of us should also learn South Indian languages, especially Tamil. Hindi should also be enriched by translating some of the gems of other literatures.

There is much confused thinking about our culture. Every one thinks himself competent enough to harangue on it. All the talk that is going on in our country on this subject only strengthens conservatism. It is well to remember that many old ideas have become effete and obsolete by efflux of time and must be discarded. But there are certain elements which deserve to be conserved and emphasized. They can also be pressed into the service of some of the modern ideas. The task before us is the presentation of careful and scientific analysis of our culture, the preservation of its vital elements and their synthesis with modern thought.

These are some of the tasks appropriate for the era of nationalism, which opened with the French Revolution. Those were the days of the rule of the bourgeoisie when nationalism was enthroned and capitalism gradually replaced feudalism. Many countries were industrialised and capital was rapidly formed. But countries like India which could not achieve national freedom during this era and had to wait till the era of Socialism opened lagged behind in industrialisation, thus being faced with the problem of accumulating capital as well as that of building up the socialist society.

The new epoch opened with the Russian Revolution in 1917. The Russian Revolution was no less decisive than the French Revolution. Masses have always constituted the supreme revolutionary force. In the past kings, feudal lords and bourgeoisie all sought their alliance to win their battles, but after gaining their object with their support they threw them overboard. The masses occupied the centre of the world stage as principals and not as allies for the first time in history in the time of the Russian Revolution. It changed the psychology of the masses all the world over. As a matter of fact, it heralded the birth of a new civilisation, but if that civilisation was miscarried in certain respects, it was because the leaders of the revolution after the victory found the position of the country insecure, because of the fear of foreign aggression and threat of civil war. They also did not always keep before them the great ends of life for which the revolution had taken place. Soviet Russia has many achievements to its credit. The Russian experiment has many lessons to teach us. We can learn much both from its success and failures. But that will be possible only if we appraise the work done there at its true value and without prejudice. My appreciation has always been critical but my sympathies have always been with Soviet Russia. And, if I have sometimes criticised some of its acts and policies with vehemence, it was not to run it down, but because I felt extremely sorry that it had missed a great opportunity, especially during and after the last war, to become an irresistible moral force which would not only have protected it against attacks of its enemies but would have greatly helped the march of those ideas for which it originally stood.

Socialism is the gospel of the new age. We of the Praja Socialist Party have to make it our life mission to spread this gospel in our ancient land and to build a new social order in consonance with its basic principles.

Ours is an under-developed country and we lack the necessary resources for financing our economic plan. We have, therefore, to apply a self-denying ordinance to ourselves, but that will be possible only if our people are convinced that the sacrifices undergone today are necessary to ensure a better future. But nothing is being done to evoke people's enthusiasm for Government's plans. Government's utter failure during the last seven years to give to the people the sense of a new freedom is writ large. The people do not feel that something has happened to them which has given a meaning and significance to their personality. They do not feel the pride of being participants in the task of national reconstruction, and, unless this happens, plans, howsoever grand-eloquent they may be, are not going to succeed. It is a truism that, unless the common citizen pulsates with a new life, he will not co-operate and will continue to remain indifferent and passive as before.

In India it was Gandhiji who was the first to realise the

importance of the masses for any national struggle. Before him our educated middle class either believed in constitutional methods or in conspiratorial work. Gandhiji identified himself completely with the masses, and when India became free, he advocated the establishment of a classless and casteless society, in which there would be no exploitation and where the people would be the supreme authority.

Gandhiji knew the Indian masses as none else did. There was a gulf between him and the educated classes, but the masses intuitively felt that he belonged to them. He had gradually become the symbol of the Indian people so much so that unless he gave a call there could be no nation-wide struggle. On many an occasion his intuition proved correct, and those who at first regarded him as a visionary came to hold the view that he was intensely practical.

The people of India were, ever since the Afghan War, anti-British always praying for the defeat of British arms whenever a war broke out, while feeling all the time their own impotence to drive them out. It was Gandhiji who placed a new weapon in their hands and restored the self-confidence which had been lost.

Some of his ideas were quite novel and it was difficult for many of us, whose habits of thought were different, to accept them. But we would have lived in vain, if we had not come under the influence of his dynamic personality and ideas. His acceptance of the ideal of a classless and casteless society made our task easy. He was wedded to no theory and he has himself said he has not given us any system of philosophy. But his mind was fertile and creative and until his last days he continued to give us new ideas.

Today, we believe that in this atomic age violence has to be ruled out both in the national sphere and international field. War is no solution of any problem. The atomic age will demonstrate that thou who still cherish a faith in violence are living in self-delusion. Co-existence, if accepted, will lessen war tension and postpone war, and will thus give breathing time to saner sections of the world community to find a permanent solution of the problem of peace and war. The permanent solution has been discussed in the Policy Statement which will be placed before you for your consideration. Unless all nations great and small are treated on a basis of equality and present day inequalities are removed, and unless rich nations treat the welfare of poor nations as their own concern, causes of national conflict will not be removed.

War is no remedy and as such has to be outlawed. We find the strange phenomenon that during the pendency of the war the devastation of enemy countries takes place on a large scale, but when the war is over victor nations find themselves under the painful necessity of spending millions on healing the wounds inflicted

during the war, and rehabilitating the economy of the vanquished countries. It has also been demonstrated that war no longer brings to victors any permanent gain. Annexations, if any, are only temporary. Thus, it is clear that wars are not a business proposition.

In the national sphere also use of violence will no longer be helpful. Military strength of the ruling party has been largely augmented due to inventions of new weapons, which make nonsense of the methods of fighting which are resorted to by a populace which has risen in revolt against the constituted authority. On the other hand, under the pressure of world events and under the growing influence of labour and other mass movements, rulers everywhere are being compelled to grant concessions to their peoples, while in free countries democratic constitutions with universal suffrage are being adopted.

As I have said above, the problem of building a new social order in consonance with the basic principle of democratic socialism is not a simple problem in a backward country. It is only a deep and abiding faith in the cause backed by knowledge that can enable us to accomplish the task. If we find that the cause is not prospering, we should exercise a little of self-retrospection, and we shall find that the fault lies with us and not with the cause. We have to be active and vigilant and continuously extend our activities to fresh fields. We have to act with redoubled vigour to make good the loss we have suffered.

Parliamentary work, struggle and constructive work are all important and each should be assigned its due place in our programme. We cannot afford to neglect any one of them. Wholesale denunciation of the Government is a pastime in which we can no longer engage ourselves with any profit. Only a critical study of Government measures will enable us to make enlightened criticism, which alone can make an impression both on the Government and the public.

Struggles against injustice are an integral part of our programme. They will bring a new awakening to our people and will also inculcate in them virtues of self-sacrifice and fellow-feeling. They will invigorate them and consolidate our forces and inspire self-confidence where it is lacking. But it is well to remember that a nation-wide struggle cannot be started with a light heart and at our bidding. Revolutions are not made to order. There is a tide in the affairs of men, but one does not know when it will come. When minor struggles are waged throughout the country with more or less success, when people seethe with discontent and their tempers run high, they are indications that a major struggle is in sight, but even then none can say with certainty that the tide will surely come. Many things can happen which may prevent it from coming. Sometimes it also

happens that quite an ordinary and insignificant event becomes the starting point of a revolution. Wisdom lies in not missing opportunities and in making preparations for taking advantage of them when they occur.

Thus, the normal day-to-day work is not at all romantic. It is in the very nature of things dull and drab. It is a truth which is plain to every trade union worker, but others whose main business is to harangue do not easily realise it. For example, everybody knows that for financing our activities the only source of our income can be a large membership and yet enrolment of members is only a seasonal activity with the result that our finances are very poor. This is a form of activity which should go on all the year round. The training of workers is an important piece of work which is not being properly attended to. Communist parties of Soviet Russia and China, train their youth not only in the communist ideology but also train them for efficient participation in the task of reconstruction of their country. When you attain power, you will need an army of builders. Comrades who have not received such a training will cut a sorry figure. It is true that today we have neither the means nor many opportunities to give such a training to our youngmen. But by making them do what little they can in this sphere we can at least make them realise the significance of this kind of work for socialism.

Above all, let us beware of rigid orthodoxy. We are living in an epoch when frontiers of knowledge are ever being widened. Reconditioning of the mind has, therefore, to be a continuous process. Besides, we should not forget that all theories and social philosophies are inadequate and imperfect and in this rapidly changing world new situations are bound to arise for which there is no ready-made prescription. It does not mean that social theory has no importance of its own. As Laski has said: "A government that has no social philosophy to guide it in the modern complex world will insensibly fall under the influence of capitalist ideology." But it can only serve as a guide to action. The following observations of Engels (letters to Americans) deserve to be widely known:—

"There is no classic straight line. The masses are to be set in motion only along the road that fits each country and the prevailing circumstances, which is usually a round about road.

"I am opposed to doctrinaire attitude which only divides us into sects and weakens our forces. The Left of every country has been a victim of this malady. It has dissipated its strength in vain disputations about minor matters like some of the religious sects of India, who quarrel about external forms and practices.

"It is easy to learn a theory but very difficult to apply it to a set of given circumstances. The task of finding a suitable road

for your country is none too easy. Theories can lead you only upto a certain point. Unless you know your own people intimately, have a rich experience of human affairs, and have made careful study of the social and economic conditions of your country, you cannot prescribe the course of action for your people."

Engels had a contempt for doctrinaires and always said that his theory was only an exposition of a process of evolution.

I would like to make a special appeal to the socialist youth. They constitute the main strength of the Party. We have got good cadres of young workers. But they need special attention and every encouragement. We want more and more of such youngmen, who are prepared to make the work of the Party a mission of their lives. We have no use of careerists. The exaltation and exhilaration which disinterested service brings with it should be a sufficient reward. The noble example of these missionaries will prove infectious, and those who come under their influence will find themselves transfigured. If they serve a social cause which supplies the real needs and wants of the people, and if they completely identify themselves with their lives, they will become an irresistible force. Masses will listen to their call, and similarly youths, wherever they may be, will feel attracted towards them. The movement will gather force, and the organisation will acquire a mass character under their guidance. They will enrol in large numbers peasants, workers, lendless labourers, petty traders and functionaries in the Party. They will always educate themselves and make themselves an efficient instrument of social change. They will share with the masses their joys and sorrows. They will avoid the limelight and would like to remain unknown warriors.

Every cause has found its devoted servants. Why not socialism? We have only to work hard and establish in different places nuclei of sincere and devoted socialists. They are bound to attract others.

The future lies with democratic socialism. It is true that today the two forces that contend for the mastery of the world are communism and capitalism, and the forces that represent democratic socialism are weak. But I believe that as the cultural level of the Soviet citizen advances and the iron curtain is lifted, Soviet Communism will be more and more liberalised; and when, as is bound to happen sooner or later, China with its ancient civilisation feels itself free to act as it likes due to changes in the international situation, new trends are bound to arise which will approximate more and more to democratic socialism. This is because ultimately man will affirm his essence and, if freedom and democratic sentiment are not his essence, what else it can be? He will not always tolerate authoritarian rule, nor will he put up with the measures which tend to suppress him. It is man's nature

to seek self-realisation by expanding his self. From the family and tribal state we have gradually reached the nation state, and signs are not wanting that we are slowly moving in the direction of a world community.

The democratic sentiment is deeply implanted in man's nature and it asserts itself again and again. The last two wars were fought in the name of democracy. Its hold on the imagination of mankind is so great that even totalitarian countries have to speak the language of democracy. This is why since the end of the last war the new communist governments are being called people's democracies. There is no avowal of dictatorship of the proletariat of workers and peasants. There has side by side been a transvaluation of values, and today economic and social rights also are being more and more recognised.

Man has too long remained alienated from his true self. But when the masses are once awakened and become enlightened, they will come into their own and establish their supremacy.

REPORT OF THE GENERAL SECRETARY, TRILOKI SINGH, TO THE SECOND NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE PRAJA SOCIALIST PARTY—DECEMBER 26—30, 1955.

The First National Conference of the Party was held at Allahabad in December 1953. In November, 1954, a Special Convention consisting of the delegates to the First National Conference was held at Nagpur.

The Second National Conference is meeting at Gaya in December 1955. During this period there were changes in the office-bearers of the Party. Dr. Lohia, who was elected General Secretary of the Party at Allahabad, resigned in September 1954. Madhu Limaye and Baleshwar Dayal, two other members of the National Executive, followed him. In November 1954, at the Nagpur Special Convention, the Chairman Acharya Kripalani also resigned. Acharya Narendra Deva was thereupon unanimously elected the Chairman of the Party and by a unanimous vote was authorised to nominate the National Executive. The National Executive consisting of Dr. P. C. Ghosh, Asoka Mehta, Sucheta Kripalani, Leela Roy, H. V. Kamath, Dr. K. B. Menon, P. S. Chinnadurai, N. G. Goray, Madhav Reddy, Sadiq Ali, Baleshwar Dayal, K. R. Karanth, Raj Narain, Ganga Sharan Sinha, Ishwarlal Desai, Sarangadhar Das, Surendranath Dwivedy, Tilakraj Chadha as members, Triloki Singh as General Secretary and Farid Ansari, Bipinpal Das and M. R. Dandavate as Joint Secretaries, was nominated by him soon after and since then has been functioning with very few changes. Sadiq Ali, Baleshwar Dayal and Raj Narain, members of the National Executive, and Bipinpal Das, one of the Joint Secretaries, resigned. In their places S. M. Joshi, and Mahamaya Prasad Sinha were co-opted as members and Prem Bhasin was elected as Joint Secretary at the Jaipur meeting of the National Executive held in July 1955.

The Central Office which was formerly stationed at Bombay was shifted to New Delhi in December 1954.

The National Executive held six meetings. In its first meeting held at Delhi in December 1954, it set up the Central Parliamentary Board, consisting of Acharya Narendra Deva (Chairman), Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, Asoka Mehta, H. V. Kamath, Dr. P. C. Ghosh, Sucheta Kripalani, Dr. K. B. Menon, Farid Ansari and Ganga Sharan Sinha (Secretary).

Dr. Lohia declined to serve on this Board and in his place K. K. Menon was taken in at the meeting of the Executive held at Jaipur in July last. The Office of the Central Parliamentary Board has also been located at the Party Headquarters at New Delhi. K. K. Menon was appointed as the Joint Secretary of the Board in July 1955.

The National Executive had also in the same meeting set up a panel consisting of Purshottam Trikamdas, Ajit Roy, H. V. Kamath, Leela Roy, K. Kelappan, R. Patnaik, Kushwaqt Roy, and Awadesh Nandan Sahai, to look into the disputes relating to Party elections. No election disputes came up to the Central Office from any provincial unit during the year.

With a view to strengthen the Party organisation the National Executive carved out various zones and allocated the responsibility of supervising the work in these zones to the following persons :

Sucheta Kripalani, Asoka Mehta, Prem Bhasin, Sadiq Ali, Ishwarlal Desai, N. G. Goray, S. N. Dwivedi, Gopal Narain Saxena, Maganlal Bagdi and K. K. Menon.

The Chairman later made the following allocations :—

Bipinpal Das—*Eastern & Central Region :*

Assam, Tripura, Orissa, Bengal, Bihar, Vindhya Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh.

Farid Ansari—*Northern Region :*

Delhi, Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Bharat, Uttar Pradesh, Pepsu, Rajasthan, Kashmir.

M. R. Dandavate—*Southern & Western Region :*

Bombay City, Gujarat, Saurashtra, Maharashtra Karnatak, Hyderabad, Mysore, Tamilnad, Travancore-Cochin, Andhra.

MEMBERSHIP

The Special Convention held at Nagpur had extended the date of enrolment of the primary members of the Party from the December 31, 1954 to February 28, 1955. The National Executive, however, made an exception in the case of Andhra, due to the general elections to the Legislative Assembly in that State and extended the last date of enrolment of primary members from February 28 to April 15, 1955. It might be remembered that in Andhra, due to the dissolution of the old Assembly, general elections were held to the State Assembly in the months

of January and February 1955, the last date of election being 28th February. The provincial unit which had set up Party candidates for elections to the Legislative Assembly naturally wanted an extension of time and, as a very special case, the National Executive granted this extension.

The last date for the submission of the list of members and the quota therefor was fixed at April 25, 1955, for the whole country except Andhra, in which case the last date for the submission of the quota and the list of members was fixed at May 31, 1955. A statement giving the number of the members State-wise is given below :

1954-55		
1.	Andhra	5,468
2.	Assam	372
3.	Bengal	13,330
4.	Bhopal	1,269
5.	Bihar	30,359
6.	Bombay	13,575
7.	Bombay-Karnatak	343
8.	Gujarat	11,000
9.	Delhi	2,349
10.	Himachal Pradesh	200
11.	Hyderabad	5,147
12.	Jammu & Kashmir	1,001
13.	Madhya Bharat	1,788
14.	Madhya Pradesh	12,571
15.	Maharashtra	13,503
16.	Malabar	3,019
17.	Mysore	6,718
18.	Pepsu	1,530
19.	Punjab	6,913
20.	Rajasthan	1,058
21.	Saurashtra	1,000
22.	South Kanara	743
23.	Tamilnad	5,792
24.	Travancore-Cochin	8,424
25.	Utkal	5,512
26.	Uttar Pradesh	31,092
27.	Vindhya Pradesh	5,263
Total		1,89,339

Out of the above total, the central quota for the membership of 7,028 members :

Assam	240
Bhopal	1,269
Bihar	400
Madhya Bharat	34
Madhya Pradesh	80

Malabar	1,019
Rajasthan	94
South Kanara	80
Utkal	104
Uttar Pradesh	2,708
Saurashtra	1,000

7,028

was received after the due date. The National Executive, while accepting the quota and admitting the membership, did not give representation to these members in the allotment of delegates to the National Conference.

DELEGATES TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE

The National Executive fixed up the quota of 150 members for one delegate to the National Conference. The province-wise allotment was as under :

Andhra	36	Maharashtra	90
Assam	1	Malabar	13
Bihar	200	Mysore	45
Bombay	91	Pepsu	10
Bombay-Karnatak	2	Punjab	46
Delhi	16	Rajasthan	6
Gujarat	73	South Kanara	4
Himachal Pradesh	1	Tamilnad	39
Hyderabad	34	Travancore-Cochin	56
Jammu & Kashmir	7	Utkal	36
Madhya Bharat	12	Uttar Pradesh	189
Madhya Pradesh	83	Vindhya Pradesh	35
		West Bengal	89

In case of such States as did not submit membership quota and list within the due date, the following *ad hoc* allocations were made as a special case by the National Executive :

Saurashtra 3; Manipur 4; Bhopal 5.

In the case of Assam a special *ad hoc* allocation of one more delegate was given.

PARTY CONSTITUTION

The Party Constitution was adopted at the meeting of the General Council held at Indore in June 1954 and since then it has been increasingly felt that it needed several changes. The proposed amendments are placed separately before the Conference for adoption.

The National Executive at Jaipur also invited to its meeting the office-bearers of the Provincial units to devise ways and means to strengthen the Party organisation. Acharya Narendra Deva, in spite of his indifferent health, attended this meeting. The meeting lasted for 8 days.

PARLIAMENTARY ACTIVITIES

The Party has an influential and effective parliamentary wing functioning at the Central Legislature consisting of :

LOK SABHA

Acharya Kripalani, (Leader), Sarangdhar Das, (Dy. Leader), Sucheta Kripalani, Asoka Mehta, M. S. Gurupadaswamy, H. V. Kamath, K. Kelappan, Madhav Reddy, K. Subramaniam, Rajaram Shastri, Ramji Verma, Ram Nagina Singh, Vijñeshwar Missir, Thakur Jugal Kishore Sinha, Amjad Ali, Gadilingana Gowd, K. M. Vallatharas, Bhagwan Dutt Shastri, K. S. Raghavachari, and Randaman Singh.

RAJYA SABHA

Acharya Narendra Deva, (Leader,) B. C. Ghose, R. P. Sinha R. K. Biswas Roy, Kishen Chand, and S. N. Dwivedy.

The contribution of the Parliamentary wing of the Party has been no small in the building up of a democratic opposition. The Party has legislature parties in most of the States and constitutes the main opposition in Uttar Pradesh, Assam, Mysore, Madhya Pradesh and Bombay. The number of members in the State Assemblies at present is as follows :

Assam	5
Andhra	2
Bihar	26
Bombay	10
Madhya Pradesh	13
Madras	12
Uttar Pradesh	23
West Bengal	12
Hydrabad	6
Madhya Bharat	2
Mysore	7
Orissa	11
Rajasthan	1
Saurashtra	2
Travancore-Cochin	16
Delhi	1
Himachal Pradesh	2
Vindhya Pradesh	4
Total	155

The number of PSP members in the various Legislative Councils is as follows:

Bombay 3; Bihar 3; West Bengal 2; Madras 2; Punjab 1; Mysore 3; Uttar Pradesh 1.

The number of PSP members of the State Assemblies who left the Party after the Allahabad Conference is as follows:

	Went over to Dr. Lohia	Went over to Congress	Remaining Independent
Andhra	11
Assam	...	2	...
Bombay	1
Madras	3
Uttar Pradesh	2
Punjab	2
Orissa	2
Mysore	1
Madhya Bharat	3
Rajasthan	1
Travancore-Cochin	...	1	3
Vindhya Pradesh	5	5	...
West Bengal	...	3	1
Hyderabad	5	1	...
Total	36	12	4

Prabhu Narayan and Shivappa, members of the Legislative Councils of Uttar Pradesh and Mysore respectively have also gone over to Dr. Lohia's party.

Charu Chandra Bhandari and Kumar Chandra Jana, PSP members of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly, have resigned their seats to join the *bhoodan* movement.

The following 10 members of the Loka Sabha have resigned from the Party:

Went over to Dr. Lohia:

Rishang Keishing, Kerai Mushar, S. K. Razmi and Suresh Chandra Mishra.

Went over to Congress:

B. S. Murthy, Nalla Reddy Naidu, Dr. Choithram Gidwani and Nettur P. Damodaran.

Remaining Independent:

Maganlal Bagdi and K. A. Damodara Menon.

The Party Government in Travancore-Cochin fell in the month of February 1955 as a result of a vote of no-confidence. Under the extraordinary circumstances the National Executive had allowed the PSP legislature party in the T. C. Assembly to form a government although it was neither in a majority in the Assembly nor the largest single party in it. The Party assumed the reins of office in the month of April 1954, and during the few months of its existence acquitted itself fairly well and did what any government having the support of the majority could do. It made education to the junior high school (middle standard) free, a facility which is not to be found in any other part of the country except in Jammu & Kashmir. It also brought forward land reforms legislation, which though falling short of the Party's agrarian programme, has been a cause of headache to the Congress Party, which is now in power in the State, and which seems unwilling to push it through. The PSP Government was also instrumental in introducing decontrol of foodgrains and giving up of compulsory levy, which not only resulted in the reduction of prices in the foodgrains but also saved the *kisans* from parting with their produce at the controlled rates. The Ministry also launched a scheme for soil conservation and brought under cultivation 40,000 acres of land on which 5,000 families were colonised. In the labour field an Act prescribing minimum wage in industries affecting two lakhs of workers was passed and the Government launched schemes to reclaim large areas of forest and other vacant lands with a view to handing them over to the landless. It also reduced the burden upon the agriculturist by the imposition of a betterment levy instead of the exorbitant irrigation rates. During the short period it was in power the PSP Government completely separated the executive from the judiciary in the State, not a small achievement, and passed legislation conferring more powers on village panchayats so as to make them not only effective but self-governing in the real sense of the word.

BY-ELECTIONS

There have been several by-elections throughout the country during this year but the Party set up candidates in only a few of them. In the Uttar Pradesh, three by-elections to the Lok Sabha were held in February last and the Party had set up its candidates for two seats only. To the independent candidate in the third seat it lent its support. The Party candidate at Kanpur City won by a majority of 13,000 votes and the independent candidate supported by the Party also won.

The U.P. Party also set up candidates in three by-elections to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly. In Allahabad District the Party candidate had a lead of over 15,000 votes over his Congress rival and at Badaun the Party candidate had a lead of over 4,000 votes over the Congress candidate.

In Madhya Pradesh, two Assembly seats falling vacant by the death of the late Piare Lal Singh, and the resignation of Lal Sham Shah on account of the neglect of the constituency by the Government were retained by the Party.

The Party had another notable victory in the seat to the Lok Sabha from Madhya Pradesh where H. V. Kamath defeated his Congress rival by a majority of 30,000 votes. The Party also secured a seat in the Bombay Legislative Assembly in a by-election. In Tamilnad, the Party candidate to the Lok Sabha lost to his Congress rival. An assembly seat in that State contested by the Party was also lost.

GENERAL ELECTIONS IN ANDHRA

In Andhra, the Party set up 43 candidates out of 196 seats to the Assembly. Out of these 13 were elected.

JAMMU & KASHMIR BRANCH OF THE PARTY

At the end of 1954 the Party unit was formed at Kashmir. It may be remembered that the Party had till then abstained from forming a Party unit at Kashmir in spite of the local demand. As a result of the report submitted by the sub-committee appointed by the National Executive in September 1954, it was decided to form a unit at Kashmir and Asoka Mehta was authorised to do so. His visit there was marred by an unfortunate incident. It was an encouraging sign that within a short period of one month over 1,000 primary members were enrolled in that State by February 28, in spite of the severe cold weather. The Party unit has since then been functioning and the National Executive appointed Prof. Tilakraj Chadha as the incharge of the Party in that State. I was also deputed by the National Executive to visit Kashmir and I went there along with Prof. Tilakraj Chadha in June last.

The PSP unit is the only political party in opposition to the National Conference at Kashmir and naturally is an eyesore to the Government in that State. It is unfortunate that obstacles were created in the way of the Party by the National Conference workers, with the connivance and support of the Kashmir Government, and instances of assaults upon and intimidation of the PSP workers and members are not uncommon in that State. In spite of that, the unit there has been functioning as the only political party in opposition.

Asoka Mehta's second visit to Kashmir had lent added strength to the Party organisation and it is hoped that before long the Kashmir unit will be one of the most important and effective units in this country.

GOA LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Peter Alvares, Chairman, Action Committee, Goa National Congress, has been throughout in the forefront of the Goa Liberation Struggle and the PSP, which had been almost singly carrying on the movement for some time past, lent its support to the all Parties Goa Liberation Committee formed at Poona in the beginning of the year. N. G. Goray, Chairman of the Maharashtra Party and member of the National Executive, took a leading part in this struggle. He, along with Senapati Bapat, led the first batch of satyagrahis to Goa after due notice to the Governor General of that State and entered there on May 18. He was arrested and sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment by the Military Court for entering Goa. He was followed by S. P. Limaye who was also similarly sentenced.

Chandra Pratap Tiwari, Leader of the Opposition in the Vindhya Pradesh State Assembly, who along with Jamuna Prasad Shastri entered Goa with a batch of Party satyagrahis was beaten and thrown out across the border. Jamuna Prasad Shastri sustained serious injuries.

M. R. Dandavate Joint Secretary of the Party, who led a batch of 565 comrades was also beaten and thrown out across the border.

Ishwarlal Desai, Chairman of the Gujarat Party, who entered Daman with hundreds of volunteers was arrested and taken to Goa.

Jaswant Mehta, Secretary of the Saurashtra Party, who had entered Diu with a large number of volunteers was also arrested and taken to Goa. He was however released later.

J. Venkatesam, Joint Secretary of the Hyderabad Party, who also took part in the Goa Satyagraha sustained serious injuries when he was beaten and thrown across the border.

550 PSP workers from Madhya Pradesh under the leadership of Abdul Rahman Faruqi, Joint Secretary of the Madhya Pradesh Party, and Prem Vasnik, MLA, offered satyagraha at Goa. Many of them received injuries.

The Maharashtra Party alone sent over 1,000 volunteers. The Karnatak Party also sent over 300 PSP volunteers on the 9th and 15th August to Goa.

PSP workers from Bengal, Punjab, Delhi, Rajasthan, Travancore-Cochin and other parts of the country went in batches to join this struggle and some of them sustained serious injuries while offering satyagraha. In all 4,000 Party workers took part in the struggle.

Three Party comrades, Pannalal Yadav of Rajasthan, Hirve Guruji and Sheshnath Wadekar of the Maharashtra Party, laid down their lives in this movement. Sardar Karnail Singh, who had accompanied the batch of satyagrahis sent by the Punjab Party, was another martyr who sacrificed his life for the freedom of Goa. Shri Sham Giri of Bihar, who had gone with the Party's batch of satyagrahis, was also shot dead.

U. P. IRRIGATION SATYAGRAHA

In February 1954 the U.P. Party had launched satyagraha for the remission of enhanced irrigation rates in that State. The Government had in the course of two years enhanced the irrigation rates from 100 to 250%. In spite of the agitation, extending over a period of 12 months, the Government had not done anything in the matter and instead announced that the Kisans in U.P. were in a position to pay the enhanced irrigation rates, and that the demand for remission had been made by the PSP only for political reasons. The PSP thereupon launched an agitation and over 2,700 persons were arrested and sent to jail. The Government, in order to put them in prison, invoked the assistance of an obsolete Act, known as the U. P. Special Powers Act which was passed by the old Legislative Council in U.P. in 1932, to counteract the 'No Rent' campaign launched for securing remission in rent as a result of fall in the prices of agricultural produce. The validity of this Act was raised before the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad and the High Court held it *ultra vires* of the Indian Constitution. More than 2,700 persons who had been put in jail by that time were thereupon released. Even after this, the Government took up an adamant attitude and did not at first reduce the rates. Six months later, in March 1955, the U. P. Government revised its attitude and remitted 50% of the enhancements made by it between 1952 and 1954. In the case of Dehra Dun District, further remissions were granted in October 1955.

PARDI SATYAGRAHA

In Pardi in Gujarat, satyagraha was launched in 1954 to restore to cultivation of foodgrains thousands of acres of lands which had been converted to grass growing. Thousands of men and women from the villages offered satyagraha in a disciplined manner and many arrests took place. The Bombay Government which had at first treated it as only a matter of law and order intervened later to getting certain portions of the grass-lands being reverted to cultivation of foodgrains.

MANIPUR SATYAGRAHA

On the merger of the old Manipur State in the Indian Union the Government of India dissolved the elected Legislative Assembly and assumed all powers and took upon itself the

direct administration of the State through a Chief Commissioner appointed by it. This naturally was a source of great discontent to the people of the State and there have been persistent demands for the restoration of parliamentary government. The local PSP unit, failing to impress upon the Government of India the urgency for the restoration of responsible government, launched satyagraha in November, 1954. The satyagraha took the form of defying the ban of entry into the prohibited area by shouting slogans against the continuance of the Chief Commissioner's regime. The satyagrahis, although completely non-violent, were lathi-charged on several occasions. The agitation gathered strength as a result of the lathi charges. The assaults upon Rishang Keishing, M.P., and Somarendra Singh, a leading advocate and the Chairman of the Manipur Party, caused great resentment. They were lathi-charged, kicked, dragged through the streets and thrown into a drain. After this inhuman behaviour 40 satyagrahis were also arrested. As a result, complete hartal was observed at Imphal, the capital of Manipur. On November 25, the agitation gathered fresh momentum and there were several lathi charges. On December 16, over 30,000 persons participated in the picketing of the Council House and all the schools, offices and markets were closed. The people did not disperse in spite of the tear gas. The following day the Police opened fire and fired twenty rounds at Kaisampeth and Moirangson. More than 150 persons were injured. The Government did not render even first-aid to the injured. Some of the injured had to be shifted for treatment to the Hospital at Jorhat.

The National Executive deputed Sucheta Kripalani to visit Manipur and make a report. She visited Manipur with Hareshwar Goswami, Leader of Opposition in the Assam State Assembly. She made a report and also met the Home Minister, Government of India. The agitation at Manipur is still continuing and there is a persistent demand for the restoration of responsible government. Party units throughout the country on January 9 last held public meetings and took out processions in support of the demand of the Manipur people and Dr. Lohia was arrested at Manipur in June last.

TEXTILE STRIKE AT KANPUR

The other major event of the year was the strike of the Jute and Textile workers at Kanpur extending over a period of 80 days against the proposed rationalisation in that industry. The PSP workers played a dominant role in the conduct of that strike which came to an end only when the demand for the setting up of an enquiry presided over by a High Court Judge was conceded. The strike which continued for the longest period and involved over 50,000 workers was throughout completely peaceful in spite of the gravest provocation by the authorities and the local Police.

The agitations of higher prices of sugarcane in Uttar Pradesh and for land reforms in Bihar and Rajasthan and the kisan satyagraha in Malabar were launched by the Party units in these States and were a great help to the kisans in furthering their interests. The Party also lent its active support to the strike in the Lodna Collieries and the reduction of the enhanced canal rates in Bihar. 84 comrades of the Orissa Party were arrested for defiance of Section 144 Cr.P.C. at Amchna and the Madhya Pradesh Party was instrumental in getting the ban on taking out processions removed by the High Court and securing the release of 80 Party workers including several M.L.As who had defied the ban and in so doing were sentenced to imprisonment.

CANAL RATES SATYAGRAHA

In Bihar, in Shahabad District, the local unit was foremost in raising its voice against the enhancement in irrigation rates. After carrying an agitation inside and outside the legislatures, the Party launched satyagraha in which over 700 workers were imprisoned.

DISCIPLINARY ACTION

The unfortunate event of the year has been the defection of certain comrades from the Party in their effort to form another party at the instigation of Dr. Lohia.

It might be remembered that on the merger of the Socialist Party with K. M. P. P. to which Dr. Lohia was also a party, it had been decided that henceforward no Party member would carry the name of the Socialist Party or use its flag or symbol. But the new party proposed to be set up by Dr. Lohia has adopted all these.

Ever since Dr. Lohia resigned from the General Secretaryship in September 1954 he had been persistently refusing to lend his co-operation and support to the Party, in spite of the repeated requests and approaches made by the Chairman and other members of the Party. He declined to serve both on the National Executive and the Parliamentary Board and refused to attend the meetings of the National Executive as a special invitee. The matter did not end there. In January last he hinted at a split in the Party. Soon after, some other workers of the Party came out in the press with open and unfounded charges and used abusive language against certain other workers of the Party. When asked to reconsider their attitude, which was clearly not only a breach of discipline and the Code of Conduct of the Party but also constituted a flagrant abuse of their privilege as members of the Party, they refused. The result was disciplinary action against Madhu Limaye by the Bombay Party which was later on followed by disciplinary

actions against the old Executive of Uttar Pradesh for inviting a suspended member of the Party to inaugurate the Provincial Conference. All possible efforts were made to bring home to these friends the error of their ways and it was only as a measure of the last resort that the resolution suspending Dr. Lohia was adopted in the July meeting at Jaipur. Dr. Lohia had not even the courtesy to acknowledge the letter calling upon him to explain his conduct. His efforts to form another party have not met with appreciable success but it cannot be denied that about ten per cent of the Party workers have since left the Party. All those who have left the Party have not however joined Dr. Lohia's Party. The split so caused could not possibly be avoided without further jeopardising the interests of the Party. The facts relating to this defection have been dealt with in fuller detail in a separate pamphlet which has been published by the Party. I need not therefore dwell on the details. Suffice it to say that Party members as a whole have withstood the shock very well and the Party has a future. What is needed is an all-out effort at enlisting the support of progressive-minded people throughout the country.

The country is tired of the present government because of its misrule and failure to fulfil its aspirations and wants a change. For that it looks only to the PSP. Viewed in this background the split caused in the Party caused confusion in the minds of the people. It is therefore the duty of the Party workers to rise to the occasion and be an effective instrument for the fulfilment of the urges and aspirations of the people.

PROVINCIAL BRANCHES

During the year Provincial Conferences were held in U.P., Bengal, Delhi, Punjab, Bombay, Assam, Hyderabad, Pepsu, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Tamilnad, Jammu & Kashmir and Travancore-Cochin and new Provincial Executives were formed. Conferences in other provinces could not be held for various reasons and it is hoped that by the end of February 1956, Annual Conferences in all other States would be held and new Executive Committees formed.

SAMAJWADI YUVAK SABHA

For the first time in the history of the Party, differences arose between the SYS and the Party. The SYS, since September 1952, has been working as an autonomous body. Formerly it did not concern itself about the decisions of the PSP; but in April and May last the office-bearers of this body not only challenged the decisions of the Party but also called upon their members to oppose the Party and condemn it. Under these circumstances, the Chairman of the Party, Acharya Narendra Deva, declined the invitation to attend the SYS Annual Confe-

rence held at Puri in July last. The Chairman also asked other members of the Party not to take part in the conference of an organisation which was hostile to the Party. Most of the provincial branches of the SYS, however, repudiated the leadership of this group. But a question has arisen as to what should be done in such cases and it is necessary that the relationship of the Party with such an organisation should be clearly laid down.

LABOUR

In the labour field the Hind Mazdoor Sabha sponsored by the old Socialist Party, has been functioning as an autonomous body. The fact however remains that in the HMS by far the larger number of workers are active workers of the PSP and it has been the policy of the PSP to lend its support to the Unions affiliated to the HMS. With all that, certain workers of the Party in different parts of the country have been associated with trade unions other than those affiliated to the HMS. In Bengal some Party workers are also associated with Unions affiliated to the INTUC which is a Congress sponsored body under Government patronage. It is necessary, therefore, that the Party's labour policy should be clearly laid down and instructions issued to the Party workers so to conduct themselves as would further the interests of labour in accordance with the policy of the Party.

HIND KISAN PANCHAYAT

A similar question has arisen in respect of the Hind Kisan Panchayat. Party workers interested in the welfare of the Kisans have been associated with the Hind Kisan Panchayat. The relationship between the H. K. P. and the Party was discussed at the Jaipur Camp and all the Provincial Committees were asked to express their opinion upon this question. It is necessary that the Party should decide its attitude in relation to this organisation.

FINANCES

The new National Executive got a balance of Rs. 502-0-9 after the Nagpur Special Convention. The audited accounts of the period January 1953 to November 1954 (that is, the accounts of the period prior to the shifting of the office from Bombay) were received from Bombay only after this Report had gone to the press and therefore it has not been possible to incorporate them here.

The accounts for the period of December 1954 to November 1955 were audited by Messrs G. S. Bhatia & Co. and a Statement of Accounts prepared by them is appended herewith. It

will be seen that the main source of income of the Party is the contribution of membership quota received from the various provincial units. It has been difficult for the Central Office to raise funds otherwise. It is therefore necessary that steps should be devised to raise funds in addition to the membership quota. The expenses in the next year are likely to be much more than what they were during the year under review because of the coming General Elections, and, unless steps are taken to raise funds to meet the increasing needs of the Party, it would be difficult to successfully meet our obligations.

The financial condition of the provincial units is no better and the membership fee alone is not sufficient to meet their requirements.

The burden of running the Central Office mostly fell upon the shoulders of Farid Ansari, one of the Joint Secretaries, but for whose ceaseless efforts it would not have been possible to run the Central Office so efficiently.

M. R. Dandavate, Joint Secretary, in spite of his multifarious activities at Bombay has been doing his utmost to attend to the Central Office work and was of immense help in maintaining the proceedings of the Committee besides undertaking a tour of the South and drafting of resolutions which were generally referred to him.

Prem Bhasin, who was elected Joint Secretary on the resignation of Bipinpal Das in July last, has been devoting the greater part of his time to the organisation of the Party and the Central Office in addition to successfully discharging his burden of office as Chairman of the Punjab Party.

K. K. Menon who had been deputed in October 1954 to supervise enrolment of members in the Travancore-Cochin State, on his election as Joint Secretary of the Central Parliamentary Board, has been devoting his time exclusively to its work. In view of the coming General Elections, the activities of the Parliamentary Board would increase greatly and only a person of his calibre and experience can prove equal to the task.

The Office on being shifted from Bombay was put in charge of Y. B. R. Murthy, who has been ably discharging his duties. He was assisted by Vasant Shirke. R. P. Parasuram, who for a number of years was connected with the Literature Department, joined the Central Office in August 1955 and has since then been doing very useful work.

PARTY JOURNALS

Janata, published in English from Bombay, and *Krushak* published in Oriya from Cuttack, are the only two Party weeklies that are being published regularly. *The Sangharsh* (Hindi) which was being published from Lucknow and the *Janata* (Hindi) published in Patna had stopped publication. The Hindi *Janata* has however been revived from the 10th September. *Chetana* (Gujar.) is another party journal that is being published from Surat by the Gujarat branch of the Party.

Mention must however be made of the indifference of Party units and members in general towards the Party journals. The circulation of *Janata* (English) is only 2,000 copies, though there are nearly 300 regular district branches and over 3,000 constituency units of the Party.

Another difficulty in the efficient editing of the *Janata* is that Party units do not send reports of Party activities.

The financial position of the *Janata* is also not good. Party units which act as agents for *Janata* do not up their dues regularly. At the moment, the outstanding dues are nearly Rs. 5,000. Unless Party units and members take greater interest in *Janata*, enrol subscribers, send reports of Party activities and also pay their dues regularly, it will not be possible to continue its publication.

PRAJA SOCIALIST PARTY (Central Office)

Receipts & Payments Account for the Period from 20-12-54 to 30-11-55

RECEIPTS

PAYMENTS

	Rs. A. P.		Rs. A. P.
To Balance transferred		By Rent & Electricity	1,951 14 0
from Bombay Office	502 0 9	„ Salaries &	
„ Central Office share		Allowances	12,612 5 0
of Membership		„ Subventions	2,700 0 0
Fees	43,051 3 10	„ Printing & Stationery	2,061 4 9
„ Andhra Election		„ Travelling	2,759 9 0
Fund Donation	437 0 0	„ Conference and	
„ Donations	5,956 8 0	Meetings	1,317 2 0
„ Fees received from		„ Postage and	
candidates for		Telegrams	1,705 8 0
Election	461 8 0	„ Telephones	492 10 0
„ Balance received		„ General charges &	
from Parliamentary		Office expenses	1,333 3 9
Board	528 10 0	Bank charges	54 6 9
„ Literature Sale	1,080 12 6	„ Donation to Asian	
„ Subscription for		Socialist Conference	2,000 0 0
Parliamentary Board	343 0 0	„ Deposit with New	
„ Miscellaneous Income	97 0 0	Delhi Municipal	
		Committee	50 0 0
		„ Furniture	624 5 6
		„ Advance to Staff	
		and others	1,780 0 0
		„ Outstanding Bill	105 1 0
		„ Case in hand	700 10 0
		„ Balance with State	
		Bank of India,	
		New Delhi	20,209 11 10
			<hr/>
	Rs. 52,457 11 1		Rs. 52,457 11 1

Examined and Found Correct in Accordance with the
Books Produced & Information Supplied.

Sd. G. S. Bhatia & Co.
Chartered Accountants
Honorary Auditors

Sd. Triloki Singh
General Secretary

Sd. Farid Ansari
Joint Secretary

Delhi
Dated 5-12-1955.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE SECOND NATIONAL
CONFERENCE OF THE PRAJA SOCIALIST PARTY HELD
AT GAYA—DECEMBER 26-30, 1955.

I—CONDOLENCE

This Conference of the Praja Socialist Party pays its homage to the martyrs of the Goa Liberation Movement and is proud of the supreme sacrifice made by Hirve Guruji, Sheshnath Vadekar and Pannalal Yadav who were valued members of the Party. This Conference records its deep regret at the premature demise of Acharya Javadekar, Kalki, Jagadisan, Siyaram, Avad Saran Varma and Ram Naresh Singh whose disinterested goodwill for, and support to, the Party were a source of strength. This Conference sends its condolence to the families of the deceased.

II—POLITICAL SITUATION

This Conference of the Praja Socialist Party is deeply concerned over the steady deterioration in the political life of the country. Policies of the Government are leading to marked accretion and accumulation of power in the hands of the State and growing identification between the State and the party in power. This emergence of authoritarian tendencies circumscribes the liberties of the people and jeopardises the democratic foundations of the State.

2. The increasing participation of the State in economic activities in a democratic society should normally be accompanied by the fostering of countervailing forces of trade unions, co-operatives, professional and trade associations of voluntary nature, farmers' organisations and discriminating political opinion. In India, the Government is deliberately striving to frustrate the emergence and organisation of the countervailing forces: free trade unions are discriminated against and workers are dragooned into unions intimately associated with the Government and the ruling party; political opposition is systematically pulverised and the nation is led to work in terms of one Big Party and one Big Leader. The media of public opinion like the press and the radio are being used to boost the achievements of the Government and

to gloss over the shortfalls and failures, thereby rendering very difficult improvements in policies and elaboration of alternatives. Democratic debates between parties on policies are rendered difficult because of the conscious tendency of the ruling party to take up simultaneously all points of dispute and prevent any kind of sharply polarised discussion issues.

3. The Government seems to take pride in ignoring public criticism and sentiments as was seen during the Goa Liberation Movement, and likes to create an impression in the country that the most complicated national problems can and need be solved only through discussions and arrangements inside the ruling party, as has been pointedly brought out in the reorganisation of States.

4. The Government's use of administrative machinery and resources mobilised for economic development for party ends is demoralising public life. The damage done to democracy is increased by close liaison built up between capitalists and the ruling party, whereby vital concessions are made to favoured capitalists in return for large subscriptions to the party. This association between monied interests and the Government has driven deep the forces of corruption in the administration and further undermined its efficiency.

5. The Praja Socialist Party has been striving to counter these tendencies by emphasising democratic rights and liberties and fighting against injustices and hardships imposed on the people. This Conference is happy to record that in the last three years over 12,000 persons courted imprisonment under its banner to uphold the rights and safeguard the interests of the people. The Party, inspired by the dedicated efforts of its leader, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, has been trying to devote its energies to constructive efforts to impart faith, self-reliance and social well-being to the people. This Conference appeals to its members to pursue the constructive efforts with vigour and continuity and to intensify the fight against injustices through peaceful and democratic means.

6. This Conference feels that the emergence of a strong vigilant public opinion is necessary to prevent the erosion of democratic rights and liberties. To ensure efficiency in administration, to safeguard the rights of the people and elicit and enlist popular co-operation in economic development, it is even more necessary to confront the party in power by a strong opposition capable of restoring balance to the democratic functioning of our society. The emerging authoritarianism in the country, pregnant with serious danger, is at once the cause and the result of the absence of the democratic balance. The Praja Socialist Party has been endeavouring against heavy handicaps, to bring the needed balance to Indian democracy.

7. This Conference appeals to the people to realise that not only their rights and liberties but the well-being of the nation itself rests upon the restoration of democratic balance where a government is confronted by a strong and vigilant opposition. Such an opposition even aids and enables a government to put forward its best efforts. The coming months are crucial to this realisation. The people of India can use their votes to check the authoritarian tendencies of the ruling party and provide the needed checks and balances. This Conference is happy to note that by-elections have shown increasing awareness of the people of their responsibility in this direction and is confident that in the General Elections the people will not be misled by manipulations of caste and communal sentiments but will use their votes to repair the damage done to India's democratic life and institutions by building up a strong opposition capable of providing the people with an alternative administration.

II—ECONOMIC SITUATION

This National Conference of the Praja Socialist Party is of the opinion that wrong diagnosis of India's economic ills is leading the Government to elaboration of wrong remedies. It is characteristic of the Government to paint a glowing picture of India's economic health based on figures of agricultural and industrial production. In this absorption in aggregates of production, the impact on the producer is forgotten. This Conference therefore, feels constrained to direct attention to the other side of the picture : *per capita* and *per acre* production in agriculture remains stagnant; the increase in industrial production is not accompanied by increase in employment or in fall in prices of manufactured goods. The increase in farm produce has only led to fall in prices of agricultural products and consequent decline in income in rural areas. Increased industrial production has mainly resulted in an unprecedented boom on stock exchanges and a boost to industrial profits. The burdens on the poorer classes not merely remain but have grown.

2. The Second Plan, in spite of its many claims, is unlikely to correct the unbalances and inequities in economy. To finance its various schemes and projects taxes are likely to be increased and their incidence is apt to be heaviest on those least able to bear it. Increased use of deficit finance will boost profits further and increase the disparity between agricultural and industrial prices to the detriment of the smaller producer. The large expenditure envisaged in the Plan is not likely to drain the accumulating pool of unemployment in the country, which, far from decreasing, has increased by about 50 lakhs during the period of the First Plan. It is a significant commentary on Government planning that while new industrial projects are being undertaken indiscriminate retrenchment of even skilled and trained personnel continues, with no thought given to possible co-ordination.

3. Experience of Government's planning shows duplication of administration and absence of dovetailing of economic development with administrative decentralisation. The expansion of the public sector is unaccompanied by increased efficiency and any economic relationship between investments made and output obtained.

4. The Government's approach to small industries is strategical rather than fundamental. Little effort is being made to improve techniques of production of rural artisans or to reorient techniques and tools in the industrial sector in harmony with the needs and possibilities of the rural society. This Conference is firmly of the opinion that the artisan and smaller producer can be helped only when they are supported by effective State aid channelled through co-operatives. Government's partisan policies make the task of organising such co-operatives on a national scale well-nigh impossible.

5. This Conference is firmly of the opinion that until the appraisalment and approach are basically revised in terms of employment and equality the ills of the economy will grow and social tensions deepen. The health of the economy should not be judged from a few isolated large projects of development but from the sustained aid and improvement provided to the ordinary employed person and the determined effort made, through organisation of widespread works projects, to eliminate unemployment. Provision of housing is not only a social necessity but it also possesses high employment potential. The Party, therefore, advocates greater attention to rural and urban housing.

6. This Conference urges upon the people to measure economic progress not by the yardstick of propaganda but by the concrete improvement brought to the work and earnings of the common people. The Praja Socialist Party's ceaseless endeavour is to reorient the nation's economic policies and efforts in that direction.

IV—REPORT OF THE KAMATH COMMITTEE

This Conference, whilst recording its appreciation of the services rendered by the members of the Kamath Committee in making a clear and unique report on the subject of maintenance of public order in free democratic India, endorses its recommendations and requests the people as well as other political parties to accept the same so that the governments in the country give immediate effect to them.

2. This Conference would like to remind the public that the appointment of the Committee was occasioned by the police firing in August 1954 in Travancore-Cochin when the Praja Socialist Party Government was in power and that the National

Executive, in a memorable resolution, offered their apologies to the people on behalf of the Party and gave a solemn assurance that such incidents would not be lightly viewed or tolerated in a free democracy. The episode served to focus the attention of the nation on this important question in an unprecedented manner and the stand taken by the Party was universally appreciated. This Conference regrets that the non-official resolution on similar lines moved in the Avadi Session of the Congress should have been stifled by the Prime Minister himself though he referred to the Praja Socialist Party's move in the matter.

3. This Conference notes with grave concern that since the achievement of independence police firings have become, in our country, a matter of common occurrence, more than even during the British regime. The recent firings resulting in the killing of and injuries to many innocent persons in Patna, Darjeeling, Bombay and elsewhere, with a stubborn refusal in most cases even to institute judicial enquiries forthwith, betray utter callousness of the Congress Governments and the total disregard by the party in power for human values and their indifference to awakened public opinion which rightly expects better standards from a democratic government. This Conference calls upon the people of this country to condemn such apathy and failure of duty and to see that the highest standards befitting a truly democratic order are maintained by those in power to whichever party they may belong.

V—GOA

This Conference of the Praja Socialist Party pays its respectful homage to the memory of the martyrs of the satyagraha movement in Goa and Daman on 15th August and sends its greetings to the brave satyagrahis who participated in the movement despite brutal repression by the Portuguese authorities.

2. This Conference deplors the savage sentences given to Smt. Sudha Joshi, N. G. Goray, S. P. Limaye, Anthony D'Souza, Rajaram Patil, Tridib Chaudhury, Jagannath Joshi and others by the Military Tribunal in Goa and is confident that the silent sufferings of Kumari Sindhu Deshpande, Madhu Limaye, Ishwarlal Desai, Atmaram Patil and others who are still languishing behind the prison bars will inspire the freedom fighters outside to continue their struggle for the liberation of Diu, Daman and Goa.

3. The unilateral decision of the ruling party and the subsequent steps taken by the Government to prohibit the Indian people from participating in the satyagraha in Goa is a betrayal of the people's unity forged to liberate the Portuguese enclaves in India.

4. This Conference strongly feels that the only non-violent equivalent to armed intervention in Goa is peaceful mass

satyagraha and as such the Government wedded to a policy of peace must not encroach on the right of the Indian people to forge the classic weapon of satyagraha to liberate the Portuguese colonies.

5. This Conference extends its support to the decision of the Goa Vimochan Sahayak Samiti and the National Congress (Goa) to continue the struggle and is confident that the pressure of public opinion will force the Government of India to reorient its policy so as to accelerate the pace of Goan liberation.

VI—POLICY STATEMENT

This Conference
adopts the Policy Statement as amended,
refers it along with the suggestions made by the delegates at the Conference to its author Acharya Narendra Deva for finalisation,
and *directs* the National Executive to publish the finalised Statement as the Policy Statement of the Party.

VII—INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

This National Conference of the Praja Socialist Party firmly reiterates its faith in the policy of active neutrality and non-involvement in international conflicts and in a concerted effort to ensure world peace and progress of mankind towards a just and humane social order.

2. While it is of the opinion that this faith can find fulfilment only in a joint effort for peace and an equable economic development, it notes with concern that the world continues to be divided into two powerful blocs who are making desperate efforts to draw into their respective orbits countries hitherto adhering to the policy of non-involvement. The hopes held out by the Geneva Summit Conference have receded and international tensions are assuming a new dimension today with newer alignments being made by the great powers on the twin problems of colonialism and development of the world's retarded economies. Hopes and aspirations of the subject peoples and the needs of the underdeveloped countries are increasingly becoming the pawns in the ambitions of the great powers. Holding these views, this Conference cannot but regard the signing of the Warsaw and Baghdad Pacts and the extension of bloc politics in West and South East Asia as acts against the interests of world peace.

3. The United Nations Organisation, the one international body that could have played the role of a concert for peace, has been hamstrung by the veto of the Big Five and by separate military alliances. The exercise of the veto has prevented the democratic functioning of the U. N. and made the great majority of mem-

ber nations ineffectual partners in important deliberations, confining the decision on vital and fundamental issues to the great powers. The veto must therefore be scrapped the role of democratic function restored to its rightful authority and membership be made universal.

4. The arrangement of military alliances outside the U. N. has detracted from that element of security which it could have given to a world groping in anguish for peace. The military alliances and the continued existence of the Cominform have perpetuated the fear of insecurity. Both the military alliances and the Cominform must be rejected if the world is to breathe an atmosphere of security.

5. This Conference is also fully conscious of the threat that modern weapons of war hold out to mankind, and it therefore advocates not merely the banning of atomic weapons but substantial reduction of conventional armaments also, and the creation of world opinion that would ensure the diversion of these resources to development ends.

6. This Conference holds that a policy of neutrality and non-involvement to be successful must be dynamic enough so that initiative can remain with those interested in keeping the unattached nations out of the orbit of bloc politics, and in arrangement for mutual aid among them for economic development and the liberation of subject peoples. In this context, this Conference notes that the hesitant policies of the Government of India, and its anxiety to play the role of a mediator, rather than that of an initiator in international affairs, has led the nations of Asia and Africa to demand armaments or to gravitate as satellites around heavily armed powers. This tendency is assuming dangerous proportions in West Asia where the unresolved conflict between the Arabs and Israelis threatens to erupt into a widespread conflagration.

7. This Conference welcomes the friendship between India and the countries of Asia and Africa and holds that for the nations of Asia and Africa the future lies in steering clear of the rival blocs, in combining to resist colonial tyranny and in mutual co-operation for economic development.

8. This Conference indicts the Government of India for its failure to foster and encourage the initiative of our people to fight the continuing threats to our freedom. The Government of India's handling of the struggle for the liberation of the Portuguese held territories is proof not only of its ineptitude, but also of its utter lack of faith in the non-violent weapon of satyagraha as a means for the solution of international disputes.

9. This Conference deplores the failure of the Government of India to solve such vital problems affecting our nation as Goa

and Kashmir. Pursuit of general aims as against the neglect of urgent and immediate issues must lead to widespread disillusionment and frustration.

VIII—KISAN

About 80 percent of our population live in villages and 70 per cent is dependent on agriculture for their livelihood. Despite the fact that during the British regime deliberate and planned efforts were made to destroy our rural economy, and no effective steps have been taken to improve and restore it during the last eight years of Congress rule, even today about 50 per cent of our total national income is derived from agriculture, animal husbandry and allied activities.

2. This National Conference of the Praja Socialist Party is gravely concerned over the continuation of injustice, instability and disorder in the agricultural sector of our economy. The fluctuation in the prices of agricultural produce, enhancement of irrigation rates, imposition of betterment levy and such other new and old taxes have deteriorated the lot of our already impoverished peasantry. The Government have not paid adequate attention to the problem of increasing the produce of agriculture per acre. The peasantry is suffering great hardship owing to the lack of sufficient credit facilities and no encouragement is forthcoming to foster the growth of sale, purchase and such other co-operative institutions in the rural areas.

3. All over the country evictions of tenants are being effected on a large scale in spite of the tall talk about abolition of landlordism and progressive tenancy legislations. In the absence of firm determination to help the tenants, the unwillingness to implement effectively the laws enacted, and the hostile attitude of the bureaucracy, the Congress Governments have failed to put an end to evictions that are on the increase every day. No serious efforts are made to bring under cultivation fallow and waste lands by organising land armies which could have given some relief to the unemployed and under-employed persons in the rural areas. Nor is the programme of village industries being effected vigorously. The spectacle of a few persons owning hundreds and thousands of acres and crores of people without any means of livelihood is not only alarming but dangerous and is a challenge to those who swear by democracy and socialism. This Conference is of the opinion that the existing and proposed land reform legislations by the Congress Governments are not capable to end this frightful inequality and effect equitable redistribution of land.

4. The landless labourers in our villages are still living under conditions of semi-serfdom. They are not getting fair wages anywhere in the country. Even in areas where minimum wages acts are in force, they are observed more in breach than in practice.

They are crushed under the burden of indebtedness. The miserable housing conditions with which they are required to put up and the treatment meted out to them can only bring shame to humanity.

5. The PSP has persistently endeavoured for a basic change in the agrarian policy of the government. This Conference reiterates its demand for the immediate stopping of all evictions, for the organisation of land armies with a view to reclaiming fallow and waste lands, for establishing parity of prices between agricultural and industrial goods for liquidation of rural indebtedness, for redistribution of land, for encouraging formation of rural co-operatives, for adequate availability of credit facilities, for cancellation of enhanced irrigation rates, scaling down of betterment levy and bettering the miserable lot of agricultural labour.

6. The PSP is definitely of the opinion that building up of a strong peasants organisation is absolutely essential not only for the redress of the day-to-day grievances but also for creating consciousness and strength amongst the peasants which is the only guarantee for a speedy and successful implementation of its revolutionary agrarian policy. This Conference urges the socialist workers to devote themselves to this task with zeal and determination, to end injustice and inequality and to build up a new social order.

IX—I LABOUR

The working class movement in the country is passing through a critical and transitional stage in its development. The labour legislation undertaken by the Congress Government since 1947, instead of helping the movement, stifled its growth and hampered its expression. With the help of this legislation and the patronage of the Government the INTUC has undermined the independence of the Labour movement and its dynamism. For these reasons and the situation created by the First and the Second Five Year Plans, the next five years will be one of challenge and trial for the Labour movement in the country. The Second Five Year Plan lays much emphasis on industrialisation, but does not promise radical structural changes in the country's socio-economic set-up. It is true that the draft Labour Policy for the Second Plan period promises certain benefits to Labour, but it does not offer a convincing proof that the basic approach of the Government to Labour or to the Labour movement is going to be altered in any radical manner.

2. The First Five Year Plan had also made attractive promises to Labour. Actually however, in spite of the talk of industrial prosperity, there has been little improvement in real wages, housing or education and much deterioration in employment, working conditions and security of service. Minimum wage

legislation is still inadequate, tardily implemented and indifferently administered. Such social security measures as have been initiated or extended are still far short of promises. The spectre of rationalisation has introduced a psychology of insecurity in Labour, which the Government has actually aggravated by its attitude towards major disputes as in Kanpur. The Government continues dilly-dallying with Labour's demand for a more equitable, speedy and progressive Industrial Disputes Legislation while its susceptibility to pressures from vested interests has been glaringly exposed in its handling of the Bank Employees' Dispute. Against the background of past experience, the promises now offered for the future, themselves halting and vague, do not inspire much confidence. The Government lacks any policy regarding recognition of Unions. Even where they have some rules in this connection they are manipulated to help spread of INTUC only. Repeated representations by genuine Labour organisations for plebiscite to determine the representative character of Unions, in cases where they are more than one, are not at all attended to and in public sectors also the Government adopts a policy of encouraging INTUC against the wishes of the workers. This Conference demands that the Industrial Disputes Act should be so amended that the question of recognition of Unions be taken as an industrial dispute and also provision be made for plebiscite to determine the representative character of Unions in case of any dispute between two Unions.

3. The service conditions of employees in the public sector that is growing in size and importance are causing concern. Not only is Government not an ideal employer, but in actual practice Labour is denied the normal advantages available under legislation. In addition there is gradual erosion of their rights to play its part in the political life of the country. The wages and service conditions in this sector have been determined by the recommendations of the Central Pay Commission. Even all the recommendations have not been implemented. Since the last 8 years wages have been stationary and there has been a demand for a revision particularly of the lower categories. This Conference demands that a new Central Pay Commission be appointed to enquire into these demands of the employees in this sector.

4. The proposal regarding Workers' Directors on the Board of Directors is being widely publicised as the grant to Labour of share in Management. In actual practice it is unlikely that it will result in any additional powers to Labour as the workers' director, even if he has the necessary knowledge and experience, will be compelled merely to agree to decisions taken independently by the other Directors. Such an arrangement may result actually in discrediting the Workers' Directors without bringing any definite advantage to Labour. Labour must, however, not hesitate to accept the proposal and to strive to work it with intelligence and integrity though it should not expect great results from it.

5. The outstanding feature of the condition in which the Labour movement has to function today, are the continuing hostility of employers, complete lack of sense of urgency in the Central and State Governments in the administration of Labour laws, their continuing partiality towards the INTUC and even denying to Labour those rights and benefits which present legislation grants. This attitude, coupled with the hardening of the norms of wages and other service conditions, through the decisions of Tribunals and the Labour Appellate Tribunals, has brought about a stagnation in the conditions of Labour. There is no evidence today of any real change either in the attitude of employers or of the Government in these respects. A feeling of frustration has spread throughout the Labour movement and the prospects of progress through the existing law, administrative set-up and Tribunals, have practically vanished.

6. Labour will, therefore, be called upon in the next few years to face all these issues and the additional problems that rapid industrialisation will inevitably create. To the extent that it faces them boldly, intelligently and in a well-organised manner, it will not only further its own interests but also vindicate its position as the bulwark of democracy in the country. One of the major shortcomings in the Labour movement is the over-emphasis on economic gains to the exclusion of social and political ideals without which Labour cannot hope to find a lasting solution to its problems and fulfilment of its urges. The movement must therefore instil in the ranks of Labour a sense of political objectives and a social consciousness. The deliberate attempts made to isolate Labour from the main currents of our political and social life are detrimental to the interests of Labour and the country. In order to elevate the tone and temper of the movement and to infuse moral earnestness it is necessary to make the working class increasingly conscious of the higher moral purpose behind their day to day struggle for justice and enable the socialist movement to interlink these struggles of different sections of oppressed classes in a big revolutionary movement for the transformation of the entire social order. A special effort is called for from socialists in this direction to make the movement capable of facing this challenge and trial. The INTUC, lacking independent initiative and the will to fight, will not even recognise the challenge. It will simply continue to canvass for the policies of the Government and be a disrupting influence in the movement.

7. This Conference directs all the Party workers not to hold any office in central organisations (or their branches) other than the Hind Mazdoor Sabha. This Conference therefore directs all the members of the Praja Socialist Party to strengthen and revitalise the Hind Mazdoor Sabha, with a view to make it an effective instrument to lift the Labour movement out of the bog of more litigation in Court and Tribunals, to initiate planned and coordinated agitation and to stake its strength in determined fights in

support of its policies. This Conference directs the National Executive to chalk out a programme for the trade union workers and to appoint a committee to control and co-ordinate the work of trade union workers.

X—FLOODS AND CYCLONE

This Conference of the Praja Socialist Party expresses its deep sympathy with the people of Punjab, Assam, Utkal, Bihar North Bengal and Tamilnad who are affected by the unprecedented floods and cyclone, uprooting thousands of families in the provinces.

2. This Conference exhorts all the branches of the Party to raise funds for the relief of people in those provinces affected by the devastating floods and cyclone and hopes that people will respond to the appeal for funds for the humanitarian cause.

REPORT OF THE KAMATH COMMITTEE

The National Executive at its New Delhi meeting in September, 1954, appointed a Committee consisting of H. V. Kamath (Convener), Basanta Chandra Ghosh, Triloki Singh and Dr. P. C. Ghosh to examine the problem of the maintenance of public order in free democratic India.

The terms of reference of the Committee were :

- (1) Use of force by the police to maintain public peace, especially in relation to conditions under which firing can be justified;
- (2) Whether there should be independent inquiry into all cases of use of force by the police resulting in a casualty;
- (3) Responsibility of the executive and the ministry; whether the ministry should resign after ordering an enquiry;
- (4) Steps to be taken to counteract the atmosphere of growing violence;
- (5) Section 144, Preventive Detention and other coercive laws.

REPORT

1. Two fundamental principles should govern the police: (i) each policeman is responsible for what he does, and (ii) he must not act outside the laws which should carefully define his powers.

2. Every member of the police force must remember that his duty is to protect and help members of the public no less than to apprehend guilty persons and to preserve the peace. In other words, the role of the police in a democratic state is to be the friend, guardian and servant of law-abiding citizens.

3. We feel that our police should be trained to exercise a great degree of self-restraint even under great provocation from the public. We think that the police in India have to be given training in self-restraint and tolerance as well as in the exercise of tact and persuasion.

4. We think that the police in India should not be allowed to use force merely to disperse a crowd, an assembly or a procession, however illegal or unlawful it may be, unless (i) such a crowd or assembly or procession causes so much obstruction to movement and to convenience as would make it impossible for the public to carry on their ordinary normal avocations of life, and a diversion of traffic is not possible and the crowd or the procession cannot be dispersed by any other method; or (ii) unless their action causes serious damage to public or private property; or (iii) unless the crowd, assembly or the procession or any of its members are armed with deadly weapons and there is a clear and imminent

danger of their being used; or (iv) unless there are two contending groups one opposed to the other, and adopting such aggressive and bellicose attitude to one another that a riot is inevitable if they are not immediately dispersed and every other means for dispersal has failed.

5. Adequate safeguards must be provided before the police use force against a crowd or a procession, particularly before the police open fire. Besides the police officers there should be, wherever possible, a magistrate present on the spot. If the crowd shows signs of becoming uncontrollable, a notice or warning to disperse must be given, and if, after a reasonable time allowed, the crowd shows no inclination to disperse, the police may use the water-hose, tear-gas, the cane or the '*lathi*' to disperse the crowd. Such equipment should be provided to every unit of the police force by the government.

6. In most cases this much force ought to suffice and it is only as the last resort, when every other available instrument of force has failed and where there is a clear and immediate danger of loss of human life or large scale destruction of property is taking place or in case of insurrection, that the police may exercise the power to disperse the crowd by opening fire. Whether there is in fact such danger to human life must, in the first instance, be decided by the police officer or magistrate on the spot, but must ultimately depend upon what an independent judicial enquiry finds. Even then certain precautions such as first firing in the air, and secondly firing at the lower part of the body should not be lost sight of. Medical aid to the injured should always be provided with the least possible delay.

7. Coming to the second issue we are of the opinion that in every such case an inquiry by a judicial tribunal, completely independent of the executive, of ministerial control or influence, will be necessary. The police must be taught to realise that though power to use force is vested in them they will subsequently have to face a judicial inquiry whenever the use of force by them has resulted in a casualty. If this idea is always present in their mind it will go a long way towards influencing and changing their attitude, outlook and conduct in dealing with crowds, processions and meetings.

8. We are of the opinion that the inquiry should be held by a High Court Judge. We think it may be advisable to appoint a High Court Judge of another State in certain circumstances.

9. It may be desirable in certain cases to associate eminent non-officials with the High Court Judge on the Tribunal. The police and magisterial officers connected with the incident may have to be transferred to some other district if there is genuine apprehension of evidence being tampered with.

10. As regards the responsibility of the ministry, we see no reason why its fate or its career should be made to depend upon the action of an erring policeman, or upon the guile of an agent-provocateur, or the tactics of any political party.

11. If in the report of the judicial inquiry any officer, police or magisterial, of whatever rank, is found guilty of negligence, carelessness, or of having acted contrary to the aforesaid principles, or of having used excessive force, the government must punish the officer concerned.

12. The government should publish the report of the inquiry and in case an officer has been found guilty, it should also be stated what steps it has taken or proposes to take against the officer. The government must also lay before the legislature the report together with its own decisions thereon. The legislature must be given an opportunity of discussing the report.

13. If, however, the judicial inquiry fixes the responsibility not on the police or the magistrate alone but upon the government or its ministers, the ministry may have no alternative but to resign, and if an individual minister has been held responsible that minister should resign from the cabinet.

14. In our opinion, the persons injured or the relations of the deceased should have the right to file a criminal complaint against any officer who orders or uses force, and the permission of the government shall not be necessary therefor.

15. If the inquiry report discloses that any innocent person such as a casual passer-by or a distant onlooker has been disabled or killed by the police firing, suitable compensation must be awarded to him or to his nearest relatives.

16. Coming to the fourth issue, the problem of counteracting the growing atmosphere of violence cannot be dealt with in isolation. It can be effectively counteracted and ultimately dispelled only when we succeed in an all-round levelling up of the people, economically and culturally. No single organ of government, much less a coercive organ like the police, can be expected to be responsive to the dignity of human life and values in a society where millions are forced to live at a sub-normal level. Therefore, in the ultimate analysis, determined efforts to establish an egalitarian society, rid of caste, class and similar other conflicts, where none is denied the opportunity to develop his personality and to grow to his full stature, and where the people in general have inculcated the habit of tolerance as well as non-violent assertion of their rights, would alone succeed in creating the necessary basis for a non-violent society.

17. The problem is, however, a vast one and we are afraid

we cannot furnish an adequate answer within the small compass of this report.

18. With regard to the last question, we have found that the powers under Section 144 Cr. P.C. have been misused in many cases. Frequently it has been used, rather misused, as a weapon against political opponents. We, therefore, suggest that Section 144 should be amended and an order passed thereunder made appealable. This presupposes the complete separation of the judiciary from the executive.

19. We discountenance statutes such as the Bihar Maintenance of Public Order Act which continue to impose perpetual restrictions on public meetings, processions, drill and the exercise of similar other fundamental rights guaranteed to the citizens by the Constitution.

20. It is a paradox that the Article providing for Preventive Detention has been incorporated in the Chapter on Fundamental Rights of the Constitution, as if Article 22 confers on every Indian citizen the fundamental right of being detained without trial. The Preventive Detention Act is repugnant to the spirit of democracy, and it can have no place on the Statute Book of our democratic republic.

H. V. Kamath (Convener)
P. C. Ghosh
Basanta Chandra Ghosh
Triloki Singh

CONSTITUTION

I—NAME

The name of the Party shall be : Praja Socialist Party.

II—OBJECT

The achievement, by peaceful revolution, of a democratic socialist society free from social, political and economic exploitation.

III—MEMBERSHIP

1. There shall be two classes of members :—

- (a) Members;
- (b) Active members.

2. Any person who is of the age of 18 years or above and who accepts the objects, policy, programme and discipline of the Party shall be eligible for membership provided that he is not a member of any other political or communal organisation whose membership is inconsistent with that of the Party.

(Explanation : The National Executive shall decide whether a particular political or communal organisation comes within the purview of this clause.)

3. Any member who puts in some public work recognised by the Party and does not observe caste and communal distinctions shall be eligible for active membership of the Party.

(Explanation : The National Executive shall specify the activities, participation in which shall entitle a member to be an active member.

IV—MEMBERSHIP FEES

1. Each member shall pay a membership fee of Annas Eight per annum.

2. Every active member shall, in addition to the membership fee, pay annually at least his one day's average income.

He shall also collect a minimum of Rs. 3/- annually for Party funds and enrol at least ten Party members.

3. The Provincial Executive may levy additional fees on active members.

V—ORGANISATION

1. The organisation of the Party shall consist of the following :—

(a) National :

- (i) National Conference;
- (ii) National General Council;
- (iii) National Executive.

(b) Provincial :

- (i) Provincial Conference;
- (ii) Provincial Council;
- (iii) Provincial Executive.

(c) District or City :

- (i) District or City Council;
- (ii) District or City Executive.

Cities having a population of 3 lakhs or more may have City Councils and City Executives with a status equal to District Branches.

(d) Constituency Branch :

- (i) Constituency Council;
- (ii) Constituency Executive.

(e) In municipal areas having a population of less than 3 lakhs, Town Committees may be formed only for the purpose of co-ordinating the activities of the component units.

(f) Primary Units :

- (i) Ward Units;
- (ii) Local Units;
- (iii) Industrial Units.

(g) A City Branch enjoying the status of a Provincial Branch shall have Primary Units and Constituency Branches but not District Branches.

2. (a) The Provincial organisation of the Party shall be known as the Provincial Branch (*e. g.*, Praja Socialist Party, West Bengal).

(b) The National Executive shall determine the area of Provincial Branches. The Provincial Executive shall determine the area of District Branches.

3. (a) The Local and Ward Units shall be the smallest territorial organisation of the Party. The territorial area, for this purpose, shall be a ward or a group of wards in urban areas and a village or a group of villages in rural areas.

(b) The Primary Unit shall comprise all the individual members enrolled in its area or belonging to the industrial establishments concerned.

(c) A primary member may have his membership transferred from the roll of one Primary Unit to that of another with the approval of the Provincial Secretary where the two Primary Units belong to the same Provincial Branch, and with the approval of the General Secretary where the two Primary Units belong to different Provincial Branches.

VI—NATIONAL CONFERENCE

1. The National Conference of the Party shall be convened as far as possible annually at such time and place as may be fixed by the National Executive. A Special Conference may be convened by the National Executive or by the decision of the National General Council.

2. The National Conference shall consist of delegates elected by members.

3. The basic number for the election of delegates to the National Conference shall be determined by the National Executive.

4. The members of the National Executive shall be ex-officio delegates but shall not be entitled to vote, unless they are duly elected as delegates.

5. The National Conference shall have the power:

(a) to lay down the policy and programme of the Party for the ensuing year. The decisions of the Conference shall be binding on the members of the Party and its branches;

(b) to consider the Report and Audited Accounts presented by the General Secretary on behalf of the National Executive;

(c) to elect the Chairman, the General Secretary and 23 members of the National Executive, from amongst the delegates, for the ensuing year. The National Executive will continue in office till a fresh election is held at the next National Conference;

(d) to amend the Constitution.

VII—NATIONAL GENERAL COUNCIL

1. (a) The National General Council shall be one-fifth of the number of delegates to the National Conference, to be elected by the delegates from each Province as herein provided.

(b) The Provincial Secretary shall send to each delegate a ballot paper containing the names of candidates with a request to vote for such number as the Province is entitled to elect.

(c) Every Province shall, however, be given a minimum representation of one.

2. The National General Council shall meet at least once between two National Conferences and shall have the power to take decisions regarding policy, programme and organisation of the Party, provided that they are not inconsistent with those of the National Conference. Extraordinary meetings of the National General Council shall be convened on a requisition made by not less than one-fourth of its members.

3. The National General Council shall not take disciplinary action against any member or committee, nor shall it entertain any appeal against any disciplinary action taken by the National or Provincial Executive.

VIII—NATIONAL EXECUTIVE

1. (a) The National Executive, elected by the National Conference, shall ordinarily consist of the Chairman, the General Secretary and members who shall be not less than 15 and not more than 23.

(b) The National Executive shall elect a Deputy Chairman, from amongst its members, on the recommendation of the Chairman.

(c) The National Executive shall, from amongst its members, elect a Treasurer and, on the recommendation of the Chairman and General Secretary, appoint not more than three Joint Secretaries who need not be its members.

(d) The Chairman will preside over the meetings of the National Executive, the National General Council and the next National Conference and Special Conferences and act as the spokesman of the Party throughout his period of office.

(e) The National Executive shall elect a Tribunal consisting of three members, other than office-bearers of the Party and members of the National Executive, which shall have the power to entertain and decide appeals against any disciplinary action taken by the National or Provincial Executive Committees of the Party. The Tribunal shall not take any disciplinary action on its own.

(f) Any vacancy in the National Executive and the Tribunal shall be filled up by the National Executive.

2. The duties of the National Executive shall be:

- (a) to carry out the policy and programme as laid down by the National Conference and the National General Council;
- (b) to enforce the Constitution and Rules of the Party and to take any action it deems necessary for such purpose whether by way of dissolution or suspension of a branch of the Party or suspension or expulsion of an individual member of the Party. Any such action shall be reported to the next National Conference of the Party, to which appeals shall also lie from the branches and members concerned;
- (c) to organise provincial branches and supervise their working;
- (d) to appoint a Parliamentary Board with power to finalise selection of Party candidates, from amongst active members of the Party, for elections to Union and State Legislatures, settle all disputes arising out of them and co-ordinate, guide and control the parliamentary work of the Party;
- (e) to maintain accounts and submit a Report and Statement of Accounts to the National Conference;
- (f) to undertake all such activities as may further the aims and objects of the Party.

IX—QUORUM

The quorum of all Executive Committees shall be one-third of their members.

X—PROVINCIAL BRANCH

1. Provincial Conference :

- (a) The Provincial Conference shall be convened as far as possible annually by the Provincial Executive. A Special Provincial Conference may be convened either by the Provincial Executive or on the request of at least one-third of the delegates to the Provincial Conference;
- (b) The Provincial Conference shall consist of all the members of the District and City Councils in the Province, acting as delegates for the purpose;

- (c) The members of the Provincial Executive shall be ex-officio delegates but shall not be entitled to vote unless they are duly elected as delegates.
2. The Provincial Conference shall :
- (a) lay down provincial policy and programme for the ensuing year not inconsistent with the basic policy and programme of the Party;
 - (b) consider the Reports and Statement of Accounts presented by the Provincial Secretary on behalf of the Provincial Executive;
 - (c) elect from amongst the delegates the Provincial Chairman and Secretary, and not more than 19 members of the Provincial Executive for the ensuing year.
 - (d) *The Chairman will preside at the next session of the Provincial Conference as well as Special Conferences held during the year. The Chairman, the Secretary and members of the Executive will continue in office till a fresh election is held at the next Provincial Conference.*
3. Provincial Council :
- (a) The number of members of the Provincial Council, elected from amongst delegates to the Provincial Conference, shall be determined by the Provincial Executive. The mode of election of members of the Provincial Council shall be determined by the National Executive.
 - (b) The Provincial Council shall meet at least once between two Provincial Conferences. Extraordinary meetings of the Provincial Council shall be convened on a requisition of not less than one-fourth of its members.
4. Provincial Executive :
- (a) The Provincial Executive shall consist of the Chairman, the Secretary and not more than 19 members, elected by the Provincial Conference, and ex-officio members. The Provincial Executive, on the recommendation of the Chairman and Secretary, shall appoint a Treasurer and not more than three Joint Secretaries who need not be its members. Any vacancy in the Provincial Executive shall be filled up by the Provincial Executive.
 - (b) Members of the National Executive from the Province concerned shall be ex-officio members of the Provincial Executive.

- (c) The Provincial Executive may frame rules which are not inconsistent with the Constitution or the Rules framed by the National Executive.
- (d) The Provincial Executive shall submit regular reports to the Central Office of the Party, as directed by the latter.
- (e) Duties of the Provincial Executive shall be :
 - (i) to organise District, City and other Branches and Units and to supervise, co-ordinate and guide their activities and work;
 - (ii) to carry out the policy and programme of the Party and instructions and directives received from the National Executive, enforce its constitution and to take such action as it deems necessary for the purpose, by way of suspension of a subordinate branch or individual member attached to the Provincial Branch. Any such action shall be reported to the National Executive. The Provincial Executive shall be entitled to make recommendations to the National Executive in the matter of dissolving or expelling branches and members of the Party respectively;
 - (iii) to submit a Report and Statement of Accounts to the Provincial Conference;
 - (iv) to guide the work of the Party in the Provincial Legislature and elections thereto as well as the work in Local Bodies and Municipalities under the general supervision of the National Executive;
 - (v) to appoint a Parliamentary Committee with power to recommend candidates for State and Union Legislatures, select candidates for local elections and generally direct the parliamentary work under the guidance of the Parliamentary Board.
 - (vi) to undertake all such activities as may further the work of the Party in the Province.

XI—CONSTITUENCY BRANCH

1. The Constituency Council shall consist of representatives of members.

2 The basis of representation of members on the Constituency Council, which shall be uniform throughout the

Province, shall be determined by the Executive of the Provincial Branch.

3. The Constituency Council shall meet at least four times in a year with a view to further the activities of the Party.

4. The Constituency Council shall, from amongst its members, elect an executive consisting of not more than 15 members including the Secretary.

5. The Constituency Councils shall be entitled to recommend to the respective District Executive Committees candidates for elections to Local Bodies, State Assemblies and the Lok Sabha.

(Explanation: For the purposes of this Constitution, a Constituency stands for a State Legislative Assembly Constituency under the Indian Constitution. The Provincial Executive may, in exceptional cases, change the Constituency area.)

XII—DISTRICT OR CITY BRANCH

1. The District Council, to be elected by the Constituency Councils, shall consist of one-fifth of the members of the Constituency Councils under its jurisdiction.

2. Every city with a population of over three lakhs shall be considered a District. Every City Council member shall represent the same number of members as a District Council member.

3. There shall be a District or City Executive consisting of not more than 15 members, including one Secretary, to be elected by the District or the City Council from amongst its members.

4. The District and City Council shall meet at least twice a year with view to further the activities of the Party.

5. District Executive Committees shall be entitled to recommend to the respective Provincial Parliamentary Committees candidates for elections to Local Bodies, State Assemblies and the Lok Sabha.

XIII—WARD AND LOCAL UNITS

1. All members of the Party in a particular locality shall constitute the General Body of the Ward or the Industrial Units (in urban areas) or Local Units (in rural areas).

2. The General Body shall meet at least six times a year with a view to further the activities of the Party.

3. The General Body shall elect a Ward or Local Committee consisting of not more than 7 members, including one Secretary.

XIV—PARTY ELECTIONS

1. Every delegate and representative must be a member of the Party.

2. No person shall be eligible to be elected as a delegate to the National Conference or a member of the National General Council or Provincial or District City Council or any Executive Committee of the Party unless he is an active member of the Party.

XV—METHOD OF ELECTION

Voting at all Party elections shall be by *multiple distributive* vote and by ballot or by show of hands.

XVI—RULES

The National Executive shall have the power to frame rules not inconsistent with the Constitution of the Party. These rules shall, however, be placed before the National Conference or the National General Council.

XVII—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Amendments to the Constitution of the Party can only be made at the National Conference by two-thirds majority of those present and voting.

RULES (Under Article XVI)

Convening of Executive Meetings

1. Meetings of the National Executive shall be convened by the General Secretary in consultation with the Chairman or by the Chairman himself.
2. Meetings of the Provincial Executive shall be convened by the Provincial Secretary in consultation with the Provincial Chairman or by the Provincial Chairman himself.
3. Meetings of any Executive Committee of the Party shall be convened on a requisition by not less than one-third of the members of the respective Committees.

District Office-bearers

4. District Committees shall have a Secretary and no Chairman. The Executive may appoint Joint Secretaries who need not be its members.

Levy on Legislature Members and Candidates

5. The Parliamentary Board shall have the power to levy contribution on the members of the Legislatures. The Provincial Executive shall have the power to levy contribution on the members of the State Legislatures.
6. Every application for nomination on Party ticket to State and Union Legislatures shall be accompanied by a fee of Rs. 40/- and Rs. 75/-, of which Rs. 15/- and Rs. 25/- respectively shall go to the Province concerned.

Election Disputes

7. No election in the Party shall be challenged except by an election petition addressed through the Provincial Secretary to the Provincial Election Tribunal to be set up for the purpose by the Provincial Executive.
8. No Party member shall indulge in controversy in the press or otherwise in regard to Party election disputes. Appeals

shall lie in these matters to Election Committees appointed by the General Secretary in consultation with the Chairman from among the panel selected by the National Executive. The Election Committees shall frame suitable rules for quick disposal of such petitions.

Elections

9. The Provincial Executive shall divide the Province into suitable constituencies for electing delegates to the National Conference.
10. A member whose name appears in the roll of one District Branch shall not be entitled to contest elections to a District or City Council of any other District.
11. The Provincial Executive shall appoint a Returning Officer for elections to the National General Council.
12. Should any elected member of the National General Council resign, the person next in the order of preference shall be declared elected to the National General Council.
13. No name shall be proposed for Party elections without obtaining the consent of the person concerned.

Membership

14. The membership year of the Party shall be reckoned from 1st June to 31st May.
15. The National Executive shall fix a date every year for the transfer of membership. For the purpose of Party elections, transfer of membership completed by that date shall be valid for the year.
16. Membership cards, receipt books, etc., shall be supplied to any member for membership enrolment free of charge. A regular account of this shall be maintained by every Party Committee. Failure to remit the money shall make the defaulter liable to disciplinary action.

Active Membership

17. Every member desirous of enrolling himself as an active member shall have to intimate the Secretary of the Unit concerned and fill in the prescribed form.
18. A separate register of active members shall be maintained by each Party Committee. Every active member shall engage in one or more of the activities listed below:
 1. Labour
 2. Kisan
 3. Legislative

4. Co-operative
5. Propaganda and sale of Party Literature
6. Welfare and constructive work
7. Party administration
8. Women's organisation
9. Students and Youth
10. Cultural
11. Agitations
12. Bhoodan

The Provincial Executive may, if necessary, lay down further conditions for active membership.

19. Wherever possible, active members should be issued a card on which should be entered member's attendance at meetings, contributions paid, etc.
20. Any member desirous of contesting election to any Executive Committee shall have to be on the active members' register for at least three months prior to the election of that Committee and shall have collected a minimum of Rs. 3/- and enrolled ten Party members in pursuance of Article IV (2) of the Constitution.

Distribution of Membership Fees and Funds

21. 25% of the membership fees shall go to the Central Office. 25% of all purses presented to leaders on tours arranged by or on behalf of the Centre shall also go to the Centre. The Centre may not get any share of other collections.

Primary and Constituency Units

22. Every Constituency Committee must have at least 100 members and 3 Primary Units.
23. No Primary Unit can be formed unless it has a membership of 15.

Provincial Conferences

24. The Provincial Conferences shall normally be held before the National Conference.

Attendance at Executive Meetings

25. Any member of any Party Executive Committee who absents himself from three consecutive meetings of the Committee without giving a satisfactory explanation shall cease to be a member of that Committee.

Disciplinary Action

26. No disciplinary action shall be taken against any member unless he has been given an opportunity to explain his conduct.
27. The General Secretary in consultation with the Chairman or the Chairman himself shall have the power to suspend a member in an emergency. Such action, however, shall be immediately referred to the National Executive for approval.
28. The following, *inter alia*, shall constitute a serious breach of discipline:
 - (1) Writing or speaking publicly or acting against the decisions of the Party.
 - (2) Criticism by an Executive Committee member of any decision of the Committee without obtaining its sanction for doing so.
 - (3) Making public any decision of the Executive Committee by an Executive member without obtaining the express approval of the Committee or its Chairman.
 - (4) Revealing information of a confidential nature obtained in a Party Workers' Meeting.
 - (5) Misappropriation of Party or public funds or failure to pay Party dues.

Explanation: Party dues shall include membership fees, donation collected for or on behalf of the Party from the public and any contributions levied by the National or Provincial Executive Committee or the Central Parliamentary Board and amounts due on account of sale of Party journals or literature.

- (6) Contesting an election to Local Bodies or Legislatures without having obtained the approval of the Party Committee concerned.
- (7) Extension of support to an unauthorised candidate.
- (8) Public controversy in regard to candidates set up by the Party.
- (9) Public ventilation of complaints against Party members or Committees.

Explanation: Complaints against Party members or Committees, if any, should be referred to the Executive Committee concerned.

POLICY STATEMENT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

We are living in a period of transition : the old social order is being transformed into a new one.

While political freedom has brought about a radical transformation in the political system, the change in other walks of life is urgently needed. Our economic and social structures, which have become outmoded in many ways, not only suffer from inherent contradictions but are also at variance with the democratic spirit. Our economy is under-developed, is inadequate to meet our demands, and enables the propertied classes to dominate and exploit the producing masses. It denies to the latter equality, dignity and the satisfaction of even the basic needs. Caste prejudices surcharge our entire life, caste loyalties tend to undermine the growth of national unity and patriotic spirit. Our cultural life, rich in many ways, suffers from parochialism, scholasticism and sectarianism. There is complete disintegration of our moral life. Many of our moral norms have outlived their utility, being in no way suited to the age of democracy. While the privileged cling to the old moral code of hierarchical character, it is being assailed by social forces pledged to equality, liberty and free co-operation. There is considerable divergence between our professions and behaviour.

With a view to ending the confusions, contradictions and conflicts which prevail in our society we badly need social, economic and moral revolution. The entire life is to be reoriented on democratic lines, the democratic spirit is to surcharge all walks of life. We must pursue simultaneously the economic, moral and social emancipation of the people, and strive for a classless and casteless society, free from exploitation and domination.

But as in the era of foreign domination the question of political freedom had acquired primacy over all other questions, so in this era of capitalist domination the question of economic freedom has acquired primacy over all other questions. This is because the concentration of capital in the hands of a single class forms the basis of all other forms of domination, and the economic wants of the toiling masses constitute the main impelling force of revolution.

But just as political freedom by itself has failed to ensure to the people real democracy, so economic emancipation by itself

will fail to ensure to them real happiness. Prosperity is a prerequisite of happiness. But the latter as well needs the cultural advancement and the growth of moral personality. So, just as political democracy must be accompanied by social democracy, the transformation of the economic system into socialism must necessarily be accompanied by a correlative transformation in morals and culture.

The transformation is rooted in, and impelled by, our basic urges and the objective situation. But it cannot be automatic or unconscious. It requires conscious social efforts. It demands struggle against ideas and forces interested in maintaining the *status quo*.

In the course of our endeavour to build up a new social order, it is our solemn duty to vitalise what is essentially humanistic in our culture and traditions and to be helpful in the transformation of social life. But we cannot afford to be sentimental about our heritage and sacrifice our future at its altar. We will have to discard boldly what is outmoded and anti-democratic in our traditions and ways of life. Nor can we allow narrow nationalism or craze for originality to discard the accumulated knowledge and experience of the West. It is our duty to be profited by its rich democratic and socialist traditions and to enrich ourselves with the knowledge which humanity in any part of the world has been able to treasure.

Modern thought begins with the concept of progress. The latter was regarded as an essential constituent of the former. Modern thinkers differed amongst themselves as to the nature and process of progress, but all adhered to the idea. Only recently some liberal sociological thinkers have tried to substitute the concept of change in its place. Even these thinkers believe in social dynamics. But they regard the evaluation of social change, involved in the concept of progress, as unscientific. Nevertheless, socialist thinkers along with many other sociologists continue to maintain that, despite many setbacks, humanity's march towards progress cannot be doubted. Along with scientific and technological advancements and increase in material prosperity, there has also been social development and the growth of moral consciousness. The claims of the common man receive much better recognition, the toiling masses are much more socially conscious, the revolt against domination and oppression is more widespread, and the urge for freedom, equality and prosperity is more pressing than previously. Police State is being increasingly substituted by the Welfare State, colonialism has almost crumbled in Asia and has begun to be assailed in Africa, and the advancement of backward peoples towards freedom and prosperity is being increasingly recognised as the moral collective responsibility of the entire humanity. World socialist order has ceased to be an utopia or a distant goal. It is within sight. Its foundations have been laid.

Socialist thinkers hold that the liberal opposition to the concept of progress is motivated by their adherence to the capitalist civilisation which is fast crumbling. It is an indication that liberal thinkers, faced with the socialist challenge, have ceased to be progressive.

Traditionalists are overwhelmed with the march of events. They believe in the theory of progress and are convinced that in this age we are doomed to increasing misery, ignorance, and wickedness. To them the very idea of reforms is a sign of evil propensities. They wish us to think of the past, to live as our ancestors lived and to resist with all our might any conscious adjustment to the present. They often talk of the reconstruction of the present on some ancient Indian model. But they hardly care to present its blueprint. It is obvious that much of the past has outlived its utility, is outworn by the march of events, and cannot rigidly be adhered to. We cannot but live in the present, and build the future with the help of the best in the world.

We socialists must retain faith in human progress and destiny, denounce the concept of increasing regress, and march ahead with courage and determination to an era of freedom, democracy and socialism.

CHAPTER II

INDIAN SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

The Indian socialist movement which emerged in the early thirties of the century in the midst of the struggle for freedom has consistently striven as well for freedom as for socialism. Conjointly with other democratic forces Indian socialists fought against British Imperialism and insisted on complete independence for the country. After independence they have consistently striven against anti-democratic totalitarian tendencies of Congress Governments, upheld the cause of civil liberties, played the role of democratic opposition and insisted on the establishment of healthy democratic traditions and the elimination of anti-democratic elements from the Indian constitution. It has also stood for "the eradication of imperialism, racialism, colonialism and other forms of oppression and economic inequality among nations and the creation of the democratic socialist world."

Indian socialist movement tried to build up socialist forces and to spread socialist ideology in the midst of India's struggle for freedom, but recognised the primacy of the question of national independence till freedom was achieved. After its achievement the socialist movement has worked assiduously for the establish-

ment of a democratic socialist society in India. It stepped forward as "the instrument of social revolution" and became the "vanguard of the toiling masses in their struggle for a new world." The socialist society which it aims at is "a society in which there is fullest economic and political democracy."

The socialist movement has been as much the vanguard of agrarian revolution as that of the socialist revolution of the industrial system, has advocated equal consideration of needs and requirements of peasants and workers, and has been consistently opposed to the subordination of agricultural economy to industrial economy.

Under the impact of Gandhiji, Indian socialists realised the importance of the purity of means, non-violent technique of struggle and decentralised democracy and economy. They have repeatedly invited the attention of public workers to the fact that without public character no ideology can help India, and tried to invoke in them the democratic spirit and the sense of social responsibility and to propound norms of socialist morality and culture. For Indian socialists the socialist movement has never been purely an economic movement. It has also been an ethical and cultural movement. They have, therefore, worked both for the moral and cultural revolution and for the economic revolution. They regarded class struggle as inevitable in social revolution, and never suffered from the delusion that moral appeals for justice will be so responded to by dominant classes that they would voluntarily agree to the liquidation of domination and exploitation. But moral justification and ethical contents of socialism have consistently been stressed.

Thus under the impact of Indian objective situation, Indian socialist movement developed certain distinctive features. It, no doubt, drew freely on the rich democratic and socialist traditions of the West, but it also took into account the needs and urges of the Indian people and received inspiration from the vital and humanistic elements of Indian culture and national movement. Indian socialist thought, thus, tended to be a creative synthesis of accumulated knowledge and experiences of Europe and India.

Many Indian nationalists, who were opposed to the organisation of a socialist movement in the midst of India's struggle for freedom, increasingly stood for the casteless and classless society. They fought for freedom and worked for social reconstruction under Gandhiji's leadership. After India achieved her independence, they expected the Congress Governments to address themselves to the task of the social and economic reconstruction on Gandhian lines. But in a few years they were completely disillusioned, and so left the Congress and organised themselves into a new party, the Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party. The need of "political consolidation" of those who stood for "radicalism and socia-

lism" led the leaders of the Socialist and the KMP Parties to move closer together. They found themselves much in agreement. It was observed that like the Socialist Party, "the KMPP believes in the need for the socialisation of the developed sector of our economy and the need for organising and mobilising the peasants, workers, and the toiling people for their emancipation from class oppression," just as like the KMPP "the Socialist Party believes in the need for devolution of administrative authority and decentralisation of economic power as also that the conditions in India favour and necessitate the use of peaceful and democratic methods for social transformation and political reorganisation desired by the people." So the two parties decided to be fused in a single party, the Praja Socialist Party, with the object "to achieve through peaceful means a democratic socialist society free from social, political and economic exploitation." Subsequently, the Forward Bloc, founded by Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, believing in democratic socialism, also joined the Praja Socialist Party.

The Praja Socialist Party is the vanguard of the democratic socialist movement, and represents the bulk of those who stand for democratic socialism. It is, however, conscious of the need of further consolidation of democratic socialist forces, and, therefore, invites other political parties with similar objectives to co-operation and unity.

CHAPTER III

DECENTRALISED DEMOCRACY

After a prolonged struggle we have attained our freedom and set up a political structure of democratic character, broad-based on universal suffrage. But our political life continues to suffer from bureaucracy, autocracy, corruption and nepotism. The party in power refuses to be consistently democratic. It rides roughshod over the basic principles of democracy, and seems to be afraid of promoting democratic spirit and traditions. The spirit of revolt against autocracy is being smothered in different ways with the help of anti-democratic forces and traditions. The State is identified with the government, and the government with the party in power. And the resources of the State, the authority of the government and the influence of its officials are being freely used to further essentially party purposes. Active Congress workers are being recruited for Government publicity work, and different publicity organisations of the Government are increasingly becoming propaganda agencies of the party in power. While essentially national functions are converted into party functions, essentially party functions are celebrated as national functions. In short, totalitarian tendencies are being increasingly promoted. Criminal justice

continues to be administered by executive officials or by judicial magistracy under the control and supervision of the executive authorities of the district. The ordinance-making power of the executive is interpreted to mean an alternative process of making laws irrespective of the urgency of legislation. And ordinances are being freely promulgated both by the Federal and State Governments, even when no unforeseen vital interest of the State warrants immediate legislation. Elections of district and municipal boards and village panchayats are being repeatedly postponed just to suit the convenience of the party in power. Its henchmen are appointed to administrative posts of responsibility as temporaries and continued for indefinite periods without reference to the Public Service Commission. Even civil liberties of the people are not treated with due consideration. They are tampered with at the sweet will of the government, and public men of repute are often denied liberties guaranteed to citizens under the Indian constitution. They are illegally arrested, and, even when they are released by the court, they are kept in detention under the Preventive Detention Act. The public continues to be harassed both by the police and dacoits. There seems to be definite deterioration in administrative efficiency and peace in rural areas. This state of affairs is to a large extent due to the fact that a great majority of Congress Ministers, instead of democratising the State machinery, have allowed themselves to be bureaucratised by it, and that a large number of Congress legislators, instead of devoting their attention to their legitimate duties, have freely indulged in demoralising and corrupting the State officials in different ways. They are so wanting in the democratic spirit and so ignorant of the ways of democratic life that their conscience hardly pricks, however undemocratic their acts may be. They have been able to corrupt and stifle democracy, mainly because the country lacks in strong public opinion committed to democracy, and the people have not yet realised the importance of healthy democratic opposition. In many places the constitution is also so loosely worded as to permit high handed dealings at the sweet will of the Government and its officials.

Indian democracy is also being stifled by an undemocratic economic system and hierarchical social structure. There can be no real political democracy without economic freedom to serve as a foundation for it. It is nonsense to speak of democracy as actually in being where men are divided into social classes differing grossly in wealth, opportunity, status, education—in short in all those things which make the difference between ruling and being ruled, between the classes for whose sake society is administered and the classes which are doomed to serve as means to other men's ends. In the modern world there is no real democracy short of socialism.

Hierarchical social structure and democracy are anti-thetical. The caste system has no place in political democracy, much less in

socialism. It is like an iron-shell which protects a dried-up social order. It has stratified Indian society and denied to the Indian people freedom and equality, the very basic elements of democracy. It checks social mobility, perpetuates vocational rigidity, and militates against free association. It upholds anti-democratic traditions of a feudal character, stands in the way of the development of democratic spirit and civic consciousness, degrades the dignity of labour, and denies to the toiling masses even social dignity. To the socially oppressed millions freedom must mean release from the humiliation and pain of social inferiority and the fullest possible social mobility. Both political democracy and socialism need a casteless society.

It is the historic mission of democratic socialist forces in India to oppose the anti-democratic ways of the Congress and its governments, to establish political democracy on sound foundations, to promote democratic spirit and traditions, to develop the democratic ways of life in all spheres and to advance political democracy to socialist democracy. It must uphold the dignity of human labour, an important creative faculty of human personality, insist on the unity of labour and culture, and provide facilities for the cultural advancement of the toiling masses.

The Constitution will also have to be revised with a view to making it a fit instrument of full political and social democracy. For this purpose civil liberties should be made more absolute, emergency powers of the President should be narrowly defined, and the ordinance-making powers should be strictly limited to cases of great urgency affecting the vital interests of the State. The fundamental right with regard to property should be so revised that it may be possible for the legislative authority of both the Union and States to acquire property for public purposes, to sanction its redistribution on equitable basis, and to socialise industries and other economic enterprises, as well as to authorise public management of private property and undertakings in the general interest of the community or workers concerned on such terms and conditions as the legislative authority concerned may deem fit. The legislative authority alone should have the power to determine if and what compensation is to be paid in aforesaid cases. Workers' right to work and leisure should be recognised. Economic councils should be substituted for second chambers of the legislatures with such powers in the sphere of finance, economy, labour and social insurance as are granted to the second chambers under the Indian Constitution.

Standing committees of the legislatures associated with different ministries should be brought in closer contact with problems of administration. They should be empowered to make enquiries and make recommendations within the framework of their respective sphere of competence. They should be consulted by the Government before an ordinance is promulgated, or dele-

gated legislative power is exercised, or administrative policy is determined.

Democratic socialism, opposed as it is to bureaucratism and totalitarianism, favours the decentralisation of power and responsibility. It regards decentralisation as an essential component of democracy, and strongly holds that any attempt to manage all public affairs from one democratic centre i. bound to result in the establishment of a huge bureaucratic machinery which will make free democratic life almost impossible. Democracy will then lose all its vitality; administration will cease to respond to local public opinion; and administrative decisions will lack proper adjustment to local needs. It is but obvious that service which is performed at the base has greater chance of representing the views of, and of being controlled by, the people than service performed at the apex. A decentralised democracy alone can ensure active association of the people with public affairs, free society from the evils of bureaucratism and totalitarianism, generate proper democratic climate, and enable administration to respond to needs and opinions of those immediately concerned. In a democratic society local and functional autonomy must, therefore, receive all possible encouragement. A network of local democratic centres should be set up and functional associations should be organised on democratic lines. These local and functional associations should be entrusted with powers and resources adequate to fulfil the duties and responsibilities assigned to them. Their autonomy should be duly respected. Their elections should be held in time and should in no way be tampered with. Nor should any attempt be made to convert them into subordinate organs of higher authorities, much less agencies of the party in control of the Central or State Governments.

But decentralisation must be accompanied with proper co-ordination. The latter is as essential as the former. Just as differentiation and integration are inseparable components of a complex organic whole, so are decentralisation and co-ordination in a democratic structure. Without proper co-ordination, decentralisation will lead to disintegration, dissipation and the conflict of authorities. Proper co-ordination alone can ensure national unity, harmony and progress. It is recognised that co-ordination is by far one of the most important functions of the State, and that the powers of the co-ordinating authority must be based on the plenary powers of the people themselves. The democratic co-ordinating authority can be sufficiently strong to impose claims of co-ordination on other organisations only when it receives its mandate from, and is answerable to, the people directly. Higher democratic authorities, in charge of the task of co-ordination, are also responsible for many other important functions which require direct mandate, confidence and allegiance of the people. The system of indirect elections will stand in the way of direct mutual loyalty between the central authority and the people, which is absolutely

necessary to forge and strengthen national unity.

The claims of village democracy and linguistic cultural autonomy no doubt deserve recognition. In India, foundations of democracy will have to be laid in the villages, and Indian democracy cannot be strong and real, unless village democracy is firmly laid. Linguistic cultural autonomy is also needed to ensure cultural harmony and enrichment. The Party, therefore, stands for the decentralisation of power and responsibility. But it is fully conscious of the needs of functional co-ordination and national integration, and knows that decentralisation too, without proper limits, would be equally harmful in the modern age. To forge an unbreakable bond of the people with the State as might face dangers and crisis, it is necessary to develop healthy national consciousness, to which our loyalties to the village community and linguistic cultural units are to be harmonised as subordinate components. It is to be remembered that the autonomy which a village or a cultural unit enjoys is the local autonomy and not the autonomy of an independent State.

CHAPTER IV

AGRICULTURE

In a majority of European countries peasants' struggle against landlordism constituted an integral part of bourgeoisie's struggle against feudalism. European socialist movements concerned themselves mostly with the problems of industrial workers, and during the crucial periods of their growth only secondary importance was assigned to peasants. Because of this, many European social democratic parties are today faced with the problem as to how to secure the necessary support of agrarian masses. While in some European countries like Great Britain conservative parties are able to win over peasants to their side, in many other countries farmers' parties have been organised. But in some countries like Norway and Sweden agricultural workers' organisation is a constituent of the trade union organisation with a permanent seat on the national executive, most of its local unions are affiliated to the Socialist Party and most of their members vote for it in elections. In these countries the Socialist parties are also able to secure the co-operation of farmers' parties when necessary to form a stable government.

For long many Marxists in Europe failed to appreciate the role of the peasantry in a socialist revolution. It was believed that, as the result of the increasing mechanisation of agriculture, the agrarian masses would be merged in the proletariat. In the last decade of the nineteenth century Engels observed : "the greater the

number of peasants whom we can save from actual downfall into the proletariat and win for ourselves while they are still peasants, the more rapidly and easily will the social revolution take place." He wished socialists "to make clear to the peasants over and over again the absolute hopelessness of their position while capitalism rules," and to promise small peasants that "we will not forcibly intervene in the conditions of their ownership against their will", will stand decidedly on the side of the small peasant, "will do everything in anyway admissible to make his lot more bearable, to facilitate his transition to the co-operative, if he decides to take this step, and even if he cannot yet bring himself to this decision, to make a longer period of consideration possible for him on his holding". Still, Engels' advice was not much heeded and adequate efforts were not made to win peasants to the side of socialism on the lines indicated by him. On the eve of the Russian Revolution, Lenin advocated the alliance of the proletariat and peasants, but assigned to the latter only a subordinate position in that alliance. So in the Soviet Union, peasants' interest failed to receive equal and fair consideration. Under Stalin's leadership collectivisation was imposed upon peasants against their will. Today, agricultural economy is the weakest link of the Soviet economy. There is no parity in incomes of agricultural and industrial workers. Nor is there any parity between prices of agricultural products and industrial goods. Agricultural economy is largely semi-colonial in character. It has to subserve industrial economy. Peasant's interests are subordinated to those of industrial workers. Peasants have no all-union organisation of their own to protect and promote their interests and welfare.

In Asia, most socialist movements were at the first instance an integral part of freedom movements. They have always stood for the general emancipation of all sections of the producing masses and favoured their solidarity for the purpose. In many Asian countries the social content of the revolution is the agrarian revolution ; and the integration of socialism and the agrarian revolution is the greatest contribution of Asian Socialists to world socialism.

Indian peasants have not only played a glorious role in the country's struggle against foreign domination but also produced many socialist leaders and workers, and formed the backbone of the socialist movement in this country. Indian socialists have also all along been conscious of their responsibility to peasants. The former have definitely played a leading role in the day-to-day struggle of the latter, and vigorously agitated for the abolition of landlordism and the liquidation of claims and privileges of intermediaries. Indian socialists stand for the solidarity of peasants and industrial workers in their endeavour to build a new society free from exploitation of man by man, of one class by another or of one nation by another. They are definitely

opposed to the forced collectivisation of land, the subordination of agricultural economy to industrial economy and the idea of economic development at the cost of peasants. They favour equal consideration of needs and requirements of peasants and workers, and are pledged to develop national economy in a way equally beneficial to both.

To ensure peasants' solidarity with the socialist movement, it is necessary to interlink their day-to-day struggle against oppression, exploitation and other injustices with the political struggle for socialism. It is also necessary to help them realise that only under socialism would it be possible for them jointly with other sections of the working people to own the industrial wealth of the nation, to determine the utilisation and development of the country's resources and to be the masters of their own destiny in all other matters. Small peasants and landless agricultural workers who constitute the bulk of the community are, by the very nature of their economic conditions, a great revolutionary force. Their lot is the hardest of all, and they have, therefore, every reason to struggle for a revolutionary transformation of the present economic order. It is in their interest to strive conjointly with industrial workers for an egalitarian economic order. To ensure their co-operation with the socialist movement, it is also necessary to assure small peasants that socialists will not forcibly intervene in the conditions of their ownership against their will, and will facilitate their transition to co-operatives with the pace and in the manner they themselves choose. To ensure success in the matter, it will be necessary to educate them in the art and merits of co-operatives, to inculcate in them the spirit of co-operation, the sense of social responsibility and the feeling of sanctity for social property. They must also be led to realise that egoism and selfishness do not lead to happiness, that human welfare and happiness are possible only in association with others, and that they must, therefore, jointly with others, strive for social happiness, of which their own individual happiness will be a constituent. This realisation is not possible through propaganda alone. To that end peasants are to be engaged in voluntary constructive co-operative efforts in building a new village. Bands of land volunteers (Bhumi Sevaks) are to be raised in the village to dig wells, tanks, compost pits and drains, reclaim waterlogged areas, construct roads, bunds, fences, etc. It is this which will make them realise by their own experience the virtue of joint efforts for happiness and welfare. So, our task in villages is manifold. It is organisational, educative, constructive as well as combative. All these tasks require our careful attention and devoted service. We cannot, therefore, afford to be purely constructive or purely militant, but will have to co-ordinate construction and struggle in the service of the toiling masses and the cause of socialism.

The Congress Governments are proud of their achievements in the field of the reconstruction of village economy. They call it a peaceful revolution. But their claims can hardly bear scrutiny. They have no doubt abolished the Zamindari system in most of the States where it existed. But this is only the first step in agrarian reform, affecting only one-third of the country. Even this first step, as taken by the Congress, has been false and halting. Because of their anxiety to respect property rights and claims, the Congress Governments have provided for compensation to Zamindars in such forms that small landlords could not be rehabilitated in gainful occupation, big landlords were able to realise huge sums of money in the form of compensation, and poor peasants could secure no relief in rents and other dues. Tenancy rights were so ill-conceived that all the intermediaries could not be eliminated, while millions of tillers of the soil were deprived of their claims as farmers of the land which they tilled. It is almost universally recognised that the existing land tenures in India are iniquitous and unjust, unnecessarily divide Indian peasants into numerous grades, and in many cases are specially hard on poor peasants of backward communities. No attempt has so far been made to reform land tenures, basing them on some uniform equitable principles. There are wide disparities in proprietorship of land. There are a handful of peasant proprietors possessing hundreds and thousands of acres under different tenures. Along with them there are hundreds of millions of middle and poor peasants and landless crop-sharers. The Congress claims to stand for the classless society. But the Congress Government of Uttar Pradesh introduced the Bhumidhari System, and divided the bulk of peasants of the State into categories of Bhumidhars and Sirdars. Legislation on land reforms has been hesitating and piecemeal. Very often an advance notice was provided to vested interests. This put them on guard and they forestalled the reforms. Frequent amendments and absence of finality created feelings of insecurity and left the have-nots guessing. It would not be wrong to assert that more evictions of tenants have taken place during the last eight years than for a century preceding. Practically nothing was done by the Congress Governments to protect them and their rights. In case of a struggle on that account the Government officials almost invariably try to suppress the ejected peasants in various ways. It is generally recognised that social justice requires both the redistribution of land and the reassessment of rent and revenue according to some uniform principle. But no step has so far been taken in these matters. Nor have the Congress Governments done anything very substantial to better the lot of farm labourers who are living a life of serfdom. Sufficient importance is given to co-operatives in the Congress manifesto. But co-operative farming is hardly encouraged by the Congress Governments. Some Congress ministers actually condemn it and uphold that

individual peasant farming is the best form of agriculture.

Democratic socialism will abolish large inequalities of ownership and tenancy rights, clear the jungle of land tenures, and in each State so resettle revenue on a uniform, equitable principle that small peasants may get substantial relief. Efforts will also be made to replace land revenue, whenever possible, by a graded agricultural income tax.

The ejectment of tenants will immediately be stopped, and steps will be taken for the redistribution of land and the consolidation of fragmented holdings. The land will belong to the tiller; the intermediaries between him and the State will be abolished; and no one who does not personally participate in the processes of cultivation will be allowed to possess land. Efforts will be made to ensure as soon as possible that no cultivating family has less than an economic holding, and that no peasant family will be allowed to possess land more than three times the size of an economic holding.

Farm workers will be freed from their burden of debt, which is usually the cause of their serfdom, and the maintenance of even a vestige of serfdom will be made a penal offence. They will be provided independent means of livelihood. For this purpose rural industries and decentralised processes even of large scale industries will be located in villages, works of public utilities will be organised in villages, and new lands will be reclaimed through State efforts and the food army. They will be settled on them as well as on lands taken over according to the schemes of the redistribution of land and the liquidation of absentee ownership of the land. Constant efforts will be made to so reorganise the economy and social relations as to bring the income of the agricultural workers to the level of the national minimum wage and to provide them with facilities for cultural advancement and for the enjoyment of civic amenities of life.

Co-operation shall be the basic principle of the new village economy. Co-operative farming will be encouraged and multipurpose co-operative societies will be organised for marketing, irrigation, the supply of better seeds, manures, implements etc., as well as for the processing of agricultural products. Rural credit and industries will also be organised on co-operative lines. Newly reclaimed lands will not be distributed on the principle of peasant proprietorship, but will be cultivated co-operatively by those settled on them. Settlers on these reclaimed lands will not be entitled to claim them as their personal property but will have the right to use them in perpetuity for the purpose of cultivation in co-operation, to manage the farm on well-known democratic principles, and to share its yield on the basis of their contribution of labour in production.

The State will help the tillers in solving many of the difficulties that face them today. These would include the provision of better manure, seeds, implements, better marketing facilities, cheaper finance, technical assistance and research. It will also be responsible for the reclamation of cultivable waste lands, the prevention of soil erosion, the development of irrigation, the training of rivers and the proper maintenance of major roads, bunds and the drainage of rain water. Special attention will be paid to the promotion of small irrigation projects. In all these matters land volunteers and the food army will play a vital role, canalising individual efforts into communal endeavour. The State will also be responsible for the planning of production and the maintenance of prices of agricultural goods. It will also be responsible for the provision of free medical care to the people through a system of nationalised medical service and rural hospitals, as well as for the provision of free education and other civic amenities of life necessary for decent cultured life.

In the decentralised socialist State, the village panchayat, elected on the basis of universal franchise, will be the chief organ of the State authority in the village or the zone concerned. Most of the aforesaid functions and responsibilities of the State will be performed by, or in consultation with, and on the recommendation of, village panchayats, looking after the affairs of general interest to the community in the field of economic, social, civic and cultural life of rural India. It will be their responsibility to prepare a crop plan for their village, to send it to the higher organs of the Planning Commission, and ultimately to work for the realisation of the targets fixed by the Planning Commission. They will have the right to represent the village community in all matters affecting village polity and economy, and will be the main local agency for executing schemes of rural development and welfare. Their relations with higher organs of the State will be determined on principles of decentralised democracy.

The Praja Socialist Party lends its support to the Bhoodan movement for the redistribution of land. The movement has promoted public initiative and social consciousness, engendered in a large number of poor farmers a feeling to share their lands with the poorer and landless farmers, and is thereby promoting social solidarity amongst them. It is hoped that the movement will facilitate early legislation on the subject, and that it will, in case the Government is not responsive, pave the way for mass satyagraha. The Party welcomes its attack on unlimited private property as an aid in the process of social change, and notes with satisfaction that, under the influence of the Bhoodan movement, all peasants in certain villages have voluntarily transferred their entire lands to the ownership and management of the village community.

CHAPTER V

INDUSTRY

Much of our national wealth and national resources is in the hands of a minority; a minority which has exercised and still today exercises an undue influence on the economic life of the nation. The nation's industrial life is organised mostly on a profit-making basis, and narrow sectional interests still characterise our national economy. Specially with the help of the managing agency system, which is not to be found in any other capitalist country of the world, Indian capitalists are exploiting much more thoroughly both the multitude of small share holders and the proletariat.

The capitalist economic system has led to a division of society into classes and to great social inequalities as regards social conditions and opportunities. The system grants much freedom to those in possession of capital, but very little freedom and security to other citizens. It has not only produced substantial differences in the standard of living and denied to many even the bare necessities of life, it has also caused inequality in education and training, in the opportunity to share the cultural values of civilisation. The capitalist system is obviously destructive of the conditions in which alone the common morality necessary for happy social life is possible. It has generated class antagonism and conflicts, encouraged parasitic idleness, promoted selfishness and envy and led to the corruption of social ideals. Social morality is largely substituted by class moralities, and human values are substituted by monetary values. A man's worth is assessed by his capacity to amass wealth.

Capitalism all over the world suffers from inner contradictions which cause cyclic swings and economic crises that retard economic development and cause destitution to millions of the toiling masses. In the capitalist world there is unemployment in the midst of unsatisfied needs, the glaring disparity between the standard of living which the productive resources promise and that which is actually offered to the majority of the people. There is maladjustment of productive forces and considerable wastage of human energy and economic resources on account of the conflict of sectional interests and the lack of proper co-ordination.

Dynamics of capitalism have undermined its very foundations based on free competition. In spite of anti-trust laws, the concentration of capital and economic enterprises continues to grow. All over the capitalist world a small number of large corporations are responsible for a very substantial proportion of all industrial activity. In the U.S.A., a little over a hundred manufacturing corporations own a little less than half of the property, plant and equipment employed in manufacturing. This concentration has produced conditions of oligopoly and imperfect competition.

Under these conditions prices have ceased to reflect the ebb and flow of consumer goods, production has ceased to respond automatically to price changes. An increase in demand may bring increased production at the old prices, it may just as well lead to a decision to increase prices and profits with production remaining as before.

The concentration of economic power in, and financial control over, production and distribution of goods and services in the hands of a small number of corporations has compelled even many liberals, committed to capitalism, to advocate State planning and control. They are, like Franklin Roosevelt, forced to declare: "The power of a few to manage the economic life of the nation must be diffused among the many or be transferred to the public and its democratically responsible government."

In times of war governments of all complexions were compelled to acknowledge the inadequacy of the capitalist system, to introduce the State planned economy and to organise a number of economic enterprises and industrial undertakings under their own management.

The economic crisis of 1929 forced even orthodox economists, committed to capitalism, to reject many important conceptions of capitalist economy enunciated by economists of old classical school. They had also to accept the Marxian viewpoint that under the capitalist system the severity of the crises must progressively increase. They lost all confidence in the automatic recovery mechanism of capitalism, and held that the State must play the dominant role in resolving the crisis.

The economic crisis of 1929 forced even American capitalism to be transformed into regulated capitalism. It had not only to accept principles of State regulation and social welfare but also to reconcile itself with the growth of organised labour as a counter-vailing power. In Norway and Sweden, capitalism had to suffer the rule of the socialist forces and to submit to a gradual transformation to social welfare economy. In certain other countries such as Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand, capitalism is trying to hold its own against socialist challenge, but feels compelled to take over social welfare labour programme and submit to socialist achievements of Labour governments. Social welfare economy, so developed under the economic pressure of the crisis of 1929 and the social pressure of organised labour, has no doubt ensured to the workers higher standards of living and humane conditions of work as well as some voice in industrial policy through collective bargaining with employers and political pressure on the State. But it can hardly claim to be free from evils of inequality, economic domination and class conflicts, or to be immune from the possibility of economic crisis. It is sustained by a balance between socialist and conservative forces. But the equilibrium is unstable and the conflict between two forces must ultimately result in the

victory of democratic socialist forces and the conversion of social welfare economy into socialist economy.

Much is made of Keynes' solution of the problem of unemployment and economic crises under free capitalism. But it suffers from many defects. Firstly, his solution is unrealistic because it assumes perfect competition and ignores the growth of conditions of oligopoly and imperfect competition. Secondly, it makes no contribution to the solution of the problem of the maldistribution of national income, based as it is on the promise of free enterprise and increased profits as incentive to capitalists. His presentation of the under-consumption theory of economic crisis is superficial. Crisis is so imbedded in the capitalist system that it cannot be eliminated without the liquidation of capitalism. His solution has no application to the economy of underdeveloped countries.

In underdeveloped countries like India capitalism lacks in resources and qualities necessary for their economic development. Most of the Indian capitalists are stock-brokers, who are after easy and high profits through speculation, and lack in the vision and the spirit of enterprise of promoters of industries. They are shy to invest their capital in new enterprises. They want incentives in the form of high profits, but are not willing to provide necessary incentives to workers. They want all sorts of assistance and protection of the State in protecting and promoting their economic interests, but in the name of free enterprise oppose State regulation for workers' benefit and have forced the Congress Party to allow its Nasik resolution on the Welfare State to be quietly dropped. Their managerial system is rotten to the core. Family connections play an important part in the selection and appointment of managers. The technical efficiency even of industries of long standing continues to be low. In a century of industrialisation, we find no notable instance of any technical innovation introduced by Indian industry. Very few industrialists pay any attention to technical research and other methods of raising efficiency. It is but obvious that the maximum mobilisation and utilisation of economic resources and manpower is possible only under the system of planned economy, which is not possible under the competitive capitalist system. The two are absolutely antithetical.

Planned economy must necessarily be socialist. Planned socialist economy alone can ensure to the community an economic order free from exploitation, and convince the workers that their toils and austerities in the course of the economic development of the country will ultimately enable them and their children to live decent, free and creative lives in a free society. It alone can ensure necessary industrial peace and the maximum utilisation of manpower and resources for promoting production and welfare.

Regardless of these facts, the Constituent Assembly of India, dominated by the Congress Party, rejected the socialist proposal

that the State be directed to strive to promote the establishment of a democratic socialist order. The Assembly simply required the State to strive to secure a social order in which justice, social, political and economic, shall inform all the institutions of the national life, and in particular to direct its policy towards securing to the working people just and humane terms and conditions of work and certain social amenities and securities, and towards securing that "the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good", and that "the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment".

The Congress Government has so far done practically nothing to stop the growth of oligopoly or crypto-monopoly in India. It has refused even to abolish the managing agency system and the interlocking of directorates which are two important means of the concentration of the economic power in the hands of a handful of Indian capitalists and are not allowed even in capitalist countries like the U.S.A. Even if the Congress Government had tried to stop the growth of the concentration, it would have met only with limited success. Just as in the U.S.A. anti-trust laws could not stop the growth of oligopoly, so in India such laws will fail. For this purpose the socialisation of industries of monopolistic tendencies is absolutely necessary. But the Congress Government seems to be opposed to the policy of the socialisation of industries. It has no doubt socialised the air transport, but mainly because Indian capitalists were not prepared to bear the loss which the enterprise entailed. The Imperial Bank of India is nationalised, but with a view to extending banking facilities to rural areas. So this nationalisation will have no material effect on the economic power of the capitalists in the industrial sphere.

The Congress Government stands for the system of 'mixed economy' composed of State and private enterprises. Such a system is in no way new to India. Before her independence in 1947, India had already a large sector of industrial activity under State aegis. The entire railway system, the postal, telegraphic and communication services, a large number of the major electricity plants, the Reserve Bank of India and many other public utilities were owned by the Central or Provincial Governments. In addition to these, some of the Provinces and States were running industrial concerns. In April 1945, the Planning and Development Department of the Government of India issued a statement on industrial policy. In this statement it was stated: "Apart from ordinance factories, public utilities and railways, basic industries of national importance may be nationalised, provided adequate private capital is not forthcoming and it is regarded as essential in the national interests to promote such industries." In 1948, the Congress Government issued its industrial policy resolution. In this resolution it was stated that the State must play a

progressively active role in the development of industries. Industries were classified into three categories : (1) industries reserved for the exclusive monopoly of the Government of India, (2) industries reserved for State initiative, (3) private enterprise. In the first category were included the manufacture of arms and ammunitions, the production and control of atomic energy and the ownership and management of railways. In the second category were included coal, iron and steel, mineral oils, aircraft manufacture, ship building, and manufacture of telephone, telegraph and wireless apparatus excluding radio receiving sets. All other industrial activities were to belong to the third category of private enterprise. With regard to industries of the second category it was laid down that in these fields the State would be exclusively responsible for the establishment of new undertakings, though they might secure the co-operation of private enterprise. It was further laid down that existing undertakings in these fields would be allowed all facilities for efficient working and reasonable expansion for a period of ten years, after which the question of their nationalisation would be examined. The possibility of the nationalisation of existing undertakings after ten years caused such resentment amongst industrialists that the Government of India postponed the consideration of the question for an indefinite period, and its Deputy Prime Minister remarked that if anybody talked of nationalisation, it was for purposes of power or for propaganda. Even Prime Minister Nehru, in his characteristic manner, belittled the idea of the nationalisation of existing undertakings as an outworn idea. Once the question of the nationalisation of existing undertakings in even selected basic industries such as coal, iron and steel, are ruled out for an indefinite period, nothing specially socialist remains in the industrial policy ; and 1948 model of mixed economy ceases to differ substantially from 1945 model determined by an Indian capitalist, the late Sir Ardesahir Dalal, as the Head of the Planning and Development Department of the Indian Government under British aegis.

Five Year Plans cannot claim to introduce the system of State-planned economy in the industrial sphere. The First Five Year Plan was hardly a plan, as it consisted mostly of schemes launched by the Central and State Governments without any reference to an overall plan. Industrial development was regarded as "mainly the responsibility of the private sector", and no attempt was made to plan the production and distribution of industrial goods. Capitalists continued to dominate the industrial sphere of the national economy and to run industries on the usual capitalistic lines. Yet the Indian Planning Commission argued against workers' right to strike on the ground that strikes had no place in an economy organised for planned production and distribution. The Second Plan provides for the establishment of certain public enterprises in certain industries. But it also does not intend to substitute the system of the State-planned economy for that of the competitive capitalist economy. Nor is any attempt made to

arrest the growth of the conditions of oligopoly or crypto-monopoly. Though some reference is made to the question of distribution, no attempt is made to secure fair wages for workers.

The Congress Governments cannot claim to have any special solicitude for workers' welfare. They have failed to implement most of the directives of the State policy laid down in the Constitution for the purpose. Nothing substantial is done to secure the right to work. More than ten million men are unemployed even according to the Governments' own calculations. The number of underemployed is incalculable. The question of unemployment and underemployment of women has not come under consideration. No attempt has been made to secure to women equal pay for equal work. The Constitution directs the State to endeavour to secure to all workers, industrial and agricultural, a living wage and conditions of work ensuring a decent standard of life, and the Tripartite Conference of 1947 agreed to ensure to industrial workers a fair wage. But the Government got enacted only a minimum wages law, which has been brought into operation haltingly in certain selected industries. The Tripartite Conference of 1947 agreed to labour's share of the profit in industry. But no attempt has so far been made by the Congress Governments to implement this agreement, and workers remain entitled only to a bonus ensured to them under the British regime. Without implementing other agreements, the Congress Government insists on the enforcement of industrial truce on workers and has for the purpose enacted the Industrial Disputes Act. The workers' right to strike is unduly curtailed, and in almost all strikes the Congress Governments have invariably sided with the employers. In many cases strikes are ruthlessly suppressed and workers are brutally belaboured by the police. I.N.T.U.C. unions, sponsored by the Congress, function in many cases merely as liaisons between the Government and employers.

The objective of the Congress is profoundly vague and it seems to have been kept so deliberately. When the new Congress Constitution was going to be finalised, socialist democracy was proposed as its objective. But this proposal was dropped in favour of a co-operative commonwealth. The idea of a co-operative commonwealth has not so far been clearly defined. It has been interpreted differently on different occasions and by different leaders. Stripped of vague generalities, the Congress ideal of co-operative commonwealth, as defined in its Constitution, does not go beyond regulated capitalism. In its last session at Avadi the Congress has passed a resolution in favour of the socialistic pattern of society. But no attempt has so far been made to define its character clearly, and its vagueness was confessed by Pandit Nehru in the Lok Sabha. How vague the concept is, can be clear by the fact that while Pandit Nehru distinguished it from, and preferred it to, Sarvodaya at the Berhampur session of the All India Congress Committee, the Congress President sub-

sequently maintained that it would be founded on Sarvodaya.

Socialism holds that the central problem of social economy is the complete and comprehensive utilisation of the available human and material resources for the maximum production of wealth and for the maximum realisation of human welfare. Economic advance, if real progress has to be made, must be conceived not only in material terms of natural resources, capital, machines, technical skill or even production of goods, but also in human terms, in terms of human happiness, progress and dignity.

Planned economy and the socialisation of industries are obviously indispensable for the construction of such an economic order.

While planned economy alone can ensure the maximum utilisation of human and material resources in production and welfare, under socialist system alone a real planned economy is possible. Planned socialist economy will ensure the rational use of all the productive resources for promoting the maximum human welfare. It will save the community from the evils of exploitation, and economic domination by financial interests. Rationalisation will cease to be workers' bugbear as it will increase their productive efficiency without causing dangers of unemployment. Production will be considered in the light of real costs in relation to real human needs and wants; an equitable distribution of the national income ensuring means of decent life to the entire working people will be made possible; and whatever profits are made will be ploughed back for further economic development according to plan, thereby increasing the tempo of industrial development. Socialist planned economy will resolve the conflict between productive and consumptive powers, which is the root cause of crises, and will ensure a stable, evolutionary development with full employment without cyclic swings and economic crises.

To achieve these objectives, planning must aim at turning the productive resources to effective account and at guaranteeing employment at a high and even rate to all those able to work, as well as at providing a living standard for all citizens commensurate with the proceeds of joint national efforts.

National economic plan, must not, therefore, be confined to the planning of undertakings which the Government proposes to organise under public ownership. It must cover the planning of the entire economic life of the nation. It must include not only the plan of production but also the planned distribution of incomes among the entire body of citizens. It must also deal with the question of the nationalisation of private undertakings and the co-ordination of the private sector in planned economic development. It must also provide funds for planned promotion of social welfare and securities as well as of cultural advancement.

Parliament itself must be the final authority for approving the economic plan on behalf of the community. But the plan must not be prepared exclusively by Government experts and officials. The National Planning Commission must also consist of non-official experts nominated by the Central Government and representatives of important public bodies, such as trade unions, co-operatives, kisan sabhas. To avoid regimentation along with bureaucratism, sectional bodies should be consulted at all stages, local initiative should be encouraged, and regional planning committees, on the model of the National Planning Commission, should be formed with powers to assist the National Planning Commission in the preparation of the National Plan and to frame regional plans within the framework of the National Plan. Regional Plans must also be submitted to corresponding local authorities for their approval. Within the framework of the National Plan regional authorities should be allowed wide direction to plan and execute regional economic development in accordance with the wishes and needs of the people of the region concerned.

Socialisation must take a form that is adjusted to the nature of the industry, so that it may always result in higher output, better distribution and greater security and freedom for the workers.

Co-operatives are an essential factor in socialisation. They are admirable as a method of organising the distribution of household supplies. Consumers' Co-operatives have played an important role as consumers' countervailing power against Big Business under the capitalist system and are an essential constituent of the planned socialist economic system. They may be allowed not only to handle the internal trade of consumers' goods but also to produce certain household supplies for their stores.

The small scale industry must receive devoted attention of the State in a country rich in manpower and short of capital. Its development is necessary to provide to the country a balanced economy free from unemployment. In a country where a majority of cultivators have long months on their hands, when no agricultural operations are possible, national interests require a cultivator to be in part an agriculturalist and in part an independent industrial worker. Such a co-ordination will enrich him both materially and culturally, and will better enable him to lead a life at par with an industrial worker. India is famous for its handicrafts since ages ; and it is our duty to utilise the hereditary skill of Indian artisans and craftsmen for the industrial development of the country. Planned socialist economy must, therefore, provide for the development of small scale industries. Special attention should be paid to their technological and organisational development and to the correlation of small scale and large scale industries. Technology must play its part to modernise and

develop cottage industry. Small machines worked by electricity supplied to every village house may be invented and the output per unit of labour may thus be increased. This will also eliminate the drudgery involved in certain small scale industries. If such convenient small machines are used and, if they are worked by electric power, a time may come when this kind of industry may be able to compete freely with centralised industry even in the narrow economic terms of free market. Till then small scale industry may be assigned an exclusive non-competitive sphere of activity. Attempt should be made to so co-ordinate small scale and large scale industries that standardised parts of machines and other finished goods of certain large scale industries can be made in the village homes with convenient small machines, worked if necessary by electricity. The small scale industry must be organised in producers' co-operatives.

But co-operation, by its very nature, is not capable of organising great industries. Nor is it possible to deny to the community the use of the technique of large scale production, so essential to produce basic materials and capital goods and to organise certain essential services, such as transport and the supply of fuel and power. Large scale manufacturing is no doubt developed by capitalism. But the two are not so integrally interconnected that the liquidation of the latter must imply the negation of the former. The aim in socialist society is to attain the highest possible standard of living materially and culturally. Therefore, science, technology, art, all are pressed into service to achieve that aim. All forms of production—large, small, concentrated, dispersed—are made subservient to the needs of production, employment, health and happiness.

Large scale industries must be owned by the community as nationalised industries and be on its behalf under the charge of the authorities of the Indian Union, its constituent States and local self-government, as determined in the national plan. A nationalised industry can best be run by public corporations, autonomous as far as the day-to-day policy and administration are concerned, but subject to the overall control of the aforesaid public authorities in general matters of policy. This arrangement will ensure to the community, through its representatives, necessary control over nationalised industries and will, on the other hand, secure to nationalised industries, freedom from undue political interference. They can be run as business propositions on non-party lines.

Democratic socialism stands for workers' participation in the control of nationalised industries, not only because of its effect in making the workers more conscious of their responsibility of high productivity, on which the standard of living must depend, but also because it is impossible to have a really democratic society, if most of the members have to spend most of

their lives at work under essentially undemocratic conditions. No central leadership, however wise it may be, can alone direct the economic and social development in general and in details. Such a tendency is absolutely bound to end in bureaucratic despotism, kill the democratic spirit of socialism, and convert it into totalitarian communism or administrative socialism.

Workers' right of self-government is qualified by claims of the general interest of the entire community. So, while workers can claim representation on public corporations and their boards of management, they will have to concede to public authorities representing all the citizens of the State or the region concerned the right to direct, control and supervise the management and determine the general policy which each industry or economic enterprise is to follow.

From the principle of self-government in industry it follows that the working men should have the capacity to exercise such an influence over the management as will simultaneously be conditioned by both the collective and the individual interests. In other words, they must have both a sense of responsibility towards society and necessary insight into the true state of affairs of at least the industry concerned.

This imposes on the Praja Socialist Party and trade unions the duty to develop a workers' education movement which will remove the cultural backwardness of the working class and help the workers in developing social consciousness and the capacity of judgement.

Socialism strongly holds that every one has both the right and the obligation to work. For maximum production and happiness it is but necessary that each individual is placed in a position to contribute his best to the community, and is provided with the requisite means for decent living and the growth of his personality. So, if a person performs work recognised as socially necessary to the best of his capacity, he must be entitled to a remuneration adequate to maintain him in a condition of civic efficiency, that is to say, not only in health but in a position to develop and exercise his faculties, to enter upon marriage and parenthood, and meet whatever costs of a normal family are not undertaken directly by the community. Such a reward is inherent in his quality as a human being, and along with necessary deductions for capital accumulation and for the maintenance of public services and social securities in forms of sickness insurance, maternity welfare, old age pensions, frictional unemployment aid etc. must be a first charge upon the productivity of the society. Beyond the civic minimum, differences in reward must be required by the common good of society. Such a system of reward will provide security and adequacy to all and offer to some access to comforts which are

paid for by the greater value they contribute to society.

No man, socialism holds, can claim absolute and inalienable right to property. All human rights are social, functional and evolutionary in character, and are inseparably connected with social obligations. The right of property is not an exception to this rule. Property is a social institution and like all other social institutions is governed by social laws, needs and conditions. It must satisfy claims of social good and is liable to abolition when it outlives its utility and hinders social progress or welfare. No man has a moral right to property except as a return for functions performed. No community has ever recognised the right of property as absolute or irrevocable. The community has always reserved to itself the right to modify laws with respect to property in the social interest and to acquire it from its owners for public purposes. In all countries laws of property have changed from time to time and old proprietary rights have been modified and liquidated often without any compensation.

Socialism holds that the property of the entire people is the mainstay of the community in the development of the national economy. The right of property cannot be allowed to be exercised to the detriment of the community. Private property in economic resources and enterprises cannot be allowed in forest and mineral resources, basic and large scale industries, as well as in banks and insurance business, and can be allowed in other means of production to the extent they are consistent with the general interest of the people and will be regulated and expropriated by means of law, whenever necessary, for promoting public good. The State will be the sole judge of the compensation when offered.

CHAPTER VI

INDEPENDENT VOCATIONS AND INTELLECTUAL PROFESSIONS

Democratic socialism stands for a classless society, but recognises the need of a variety of vocations. It is opposed to the domination of any profession and favours the free co-operation of different sections of the working people on terms of equal justice to all.

In the category of the working people are included not only wage workers and salaried workers, but also independent workers, such as peasants, herdsmen, artisans, artists as well as intellectuals engaged in socially useful professions.

Indian socialists are fully conscious of the importance of independent vocations. They have increasingly emphasised the social urgency and economic necessity of the invention of small unit technology and the development of medium and cottage industries on co-operative basis. They urge co-operation, not because they wish to deprive independent workers of their freedom, but because in co-operation lies the salvation of small unit economic enterprises. It was co-operation that enabled Scandinavian peasants to pull through the economic crisis of the thirties of this century and to organise their dairy industries on sound foundations. Co-operation alone will enable cottage industries and small unit enterprises to flourish in India.

Democratic socialism is opposed to the ideas of technocracy and managerial domination over industry. It believes in industrial democracy and is not prepared to stand technocrats' dictation of society or managers' despotic rule over industry. It stands for workers' active and creative participation in social management. But it finds no antagonism between manual work and technical skill. It regards their proper co-ordination as very essential for industrial development. It encourages workers to acquire technical skill and wishes them to welcome and be helpful in technological development. Technicians, it holds, constitute an integral part of workers' fraternity, and their relations with manual workers should be fraternal and co-operative. The two are essential components of the industrial society, and in their harmony lies the industrial development and prosperity. Managers and technicians should cease to be agents of capitalism, fraternise with manual workers, and conjointly with them build a socialist economy. As builders of socialist economy they are sure to be more respected in a socialist society than they are in the existing society, in which they have to function as agents of capitalism, subserve the exploitation and submit to the whims, fads and dictates of functionless capitalists who have arrogantly assumed the role of captains of industry. Socialists have no doubt in their mind that it is more human and dignified to be a co-partner in a social enterprise than to be a subordinate agent of a private enterprise. They also hope that if managers and technicians cast off their superiority complex against manual workers and try to work with them as equal co-partners in a common enterprise, manual workers would respond to their spirit of fellowship and co-operation and would cast off their own inferiority complex which is mainly the product of the capitalist system.

Socialism has never thought and could never think ill of intellectual professions and pursuits, indispensable as they are for civilised social life. Socialists neither value knowledge for its own sake which some liberal thinkers profess, nor agree with Plato's conception of the supremacy of knowledge, which

demands the absolute control of the entire political power by a philosopher who cannot be a toiler. They are also opposed to the monopoly of knowledge and intellectual professions and pursuits by a particular class or section of the people.

But knowledge is rated high by them. They definitely stand for its expansion and universalisation and wish its maximum application to needs of life. Unity of knowledge and labour is an important principle of socialism. It means that avenues of knowledge must be open to manual workers and their children, that their social origin must not debar them from intellectual advancement, that adequate facilities be provided to them by the community in their pursuit of knowledge. It also means that there should be proper co-ordination of general education and vocational training, that every child should have basic training both in citizenship and some useful profession or vocation. It further means that even ordinary manual work should be as skilful as available knowledge can make it. Last but not least it means fellowship between manual workers and intellectual workers. Socialism stands for classless society and this cannot be realised unless the two realise their oneness. To achieve it the people will have to cast off their social prejudices and inhibitions and break the social crust which has tended to separate the two for ages. It is sure to be facilitated by social mobility between the two groups and the cultural advancement and the social upgrading of manual workers. The process has begun. The two groups have ceased to be exclusive. They overlap and tend to intermingle. The skilled labour of certain categories has acquired a sort of parity with the intellectual work of certain types. While modern technology has made it difficult to draw a hard and fast line between the two, increasing facilities of intellectual advancement have made it possible for manual workers and their children to cross over the line and join intellectual professions and pursuits.

This process of the social assimilation of intellectual and manual workers deserves to be welcomed and consciously promoted, as it leads to social harmony and the enrichment of intellectual life and will enable intellectual professions and pursuits to enlist mass social support for their advancement. Nothing will be more harmful to social progress in India than a perpetual feud between intellectual and manual workers. In days of democracy the intellectual group can cherish the spirit of exclusiveness at its own peril. Such a spirit is sure to isolate it from the rest of the community, rob it of its claims to social leadership, and is likely to deny it even the opportunity of self-perpetuation.

In the past the intellectual life of India suffered from exclusiveness which caused stagnation and decay. For its invigoration it needs expansion and wide contacts. Its expansion and democratisation, instead of lowering intellectual standards, will

enrich intellectual life. Democracies of the world have amply proved it. Socialism has in no way been less solicitous of the advancement of knowledge and intellectual pursuits. It has decidedly been more generous in the allotment of funds for them and has held intellectuals in higher regard than capitalist democracies. The elimination of capitalism and consequently of the capitalist class is sure to upgrade intellectuals socially. In a free socialist society their stature is bound to be higher than what it is under capitalist democracies. This can be noticed even in the Soviet Union, where unfortunately dictatorship has denied to them necessary intellectual freedom, imposed on them politically determined truths and suffocated the intellect with indoctrination. But democratic socialism cannot be accused of such perversions, as it stands for freedom of thought and is opposed to dictatorship in any form or sphere. It wishes intellectuals to cultivate wide human sympathies, to be purposive in their intellectual pursuit, to be solicitous of social good, but assures them full intellectual freedom.

When democratic socialism wishes intellectual workers to realise their oneness with manual workers, it does not wish the former to adopt ways and manners forced on the latter by capitalism. It, on the other hand, intends to raise manual labour to the level of a profession. It requires industry to be informed by a principle of public service, which is integral to the idea of a profession. It wants industrial workers to evolve their code of honour and observe it faithfully. It hopes that in a socialist society workers will realise that their criterion of work is not financial gain which may accrue, but that the end of their work is to serve, and that they will be prepared to subordinate their personal interest to the achievement of that end.

Socialist society will not allow any one to charge exorbitant fees for their services and to amass inordinate wealth, but on the whole the standards of living of those engaged in intellectual professions and pursuits will be much higher. There will be no unemployment, and the social security measures will relieve them of the worries they have to face in cases of sickness, births and deaths in the family and of personal incapacity for work due to ailments, old age or some other reason.

Socialists, therefore, invite those engaged in intellectual professions and pursuits to cast off their vacillation which has caused the disintegration of their personality, throw in their lot with the toiling masses, and conjointly with them build a democratic socialist society in India.

CHAPTER VII

TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM

The society in which we live is divided into classes. Its economic system has placed the owners in a position of power in relation to the non-owning workers, has enabled the former to dictate terms and exact a toll from the latter. It has produced a clash of interests which has generated class struggle and class consciousness. Class struggles, thus, rooted in our present system of production and is primarily generic in character.

Class conflict is a perpetual phenomenon of class society. It goes on in some form or other so long as society is rent into classes. All sections of society somehow get involved in it. In class conflict the role of different classes is determined by their position in the existing economic era and the prospects in the new one. Those who are oppressed under the existing mode of production and have better prospects under the new one stand for the change and can play a revolutionary role, while those who occupy positions of dominance under the existing one stand for the *status quo* and play the conservative or reactionary role. Intermediary classes who are uncomfortable but not oppressed under the existing system and are likely to gain as well as to lose under the succeeding one tend to play the reformist role and vacillate in case of intense class conflict between the oppressor and the oppressed classes. Remnants of classes which were dominant in the past under some old mode of production play in general a conservative role.

In this class struggle socialism definitely stands with the oppressed classes, because it is convinced that their cause is just, and that the new economic order is needed to promote progress and prosperity of the nation and to ensure to the toiling masses equal and ample facilities for the enjoyment of a decent cultured life and the free development of their personalities. Socialism strongly holds that the class struggle of the oppressed classes is as just as the national struggle for freedom against foreign domination. Any radical transformation of an economic order has never been automatic. Even when economic conditions are ripe for the change, it is resisted by the dominant class. History does not record a single case where an entire class of people in response to moral appeals so changed its outlook and attitude as to allow the liquidation of its dominance and privileges without some sort of pressure and conflict. And there is no reason to believe that Indian capitalists would prove more humane than their compeers in the rest of the world. This does not mean that the moral justification of the claims of the oppressed classes is of no significance. It has its own importance in social dynamics. It elevates the tone and temper of the struggle, infuses moral earnestness and spirit in oppressed classes, makes them increasingly conscious of the higher moral purpose behind their day-to-day struggles for justice, enables

the socialist movement to interlink these struggles of different sections of oppressed classes in a big revolutionary movement for the transformation of the entire social order, and secures for it the moral support of the intermediary classes and even the active support of declassed members of the dominant class and of that section of intermediary classes which has always responded to moral causes and provided both social theorists and necessary leadership to revolutions. This also enables the common man to realise that the struggle is against the iniquitous system and not against individuals. A moral agitation can, however, serve its revolutionary purpose only when it is an aid to a revolutionary struggle.

It is often maintained that the phenomenon of the Welfare State completely negatives the validity of class struggle. But it is a misreading of the social dynamics of the Welfare State. In the U.S.A., the Welfare State is largely a product of the economic crisis which started in 1929 and failed to be resolved through usual capitalistic processes. But in Europe the Welfare State is as much the product of class struggles of the organised labour. No Welfare State has ever been a free gift of the capitalist class or a product of its imaginative sympathies or moral consciousness. In the U. S. A., the capitalist class continues to hold the position of dominance and there is nothing to make us believe that it will consent to the liquidation of its authority through a process of class collaboration. But for the countervailing power of the organised labour, American capitalists would have been more exacting and less responsive to reason. It is also obvious that if capitalist economy is to be replaced by socialist economy, American labour would have to think in terms of the conquest of power, to develop political solidarity and class consciousness. So long as American labour is satisfied with its role of a pressure group, it will continue to be ruled and exploited by the capitalists. In Norway and Sweden, the Welfare State is founded on the conquest of power by politically conscious labour. There the capitalist class has ceased to be dominant, trade union movement is interlaced with the political labour movement, and so socialist transformation of the Welfare State is possible through the democratic process. Still, even there socialist forces cannot afford to be complacent and friendly to the capitalist class; solidarity and class consciousness of the working classes will have to be preserved; their capacity to face counter-revolutionary forces will have to be strengthened; the policy of increasing control will have to be followed; and one onward march towards a socialist era will have to be continued with determination and vigour. The acquiescence of capitalists in Scandinavia in social welfare economy must not lead us to believe that they would stand the entire liquidation of their economic power even without the democratic pressure of the working classes. As a matter of fact, capitalists have begun to use social welfare economy as a buttress of inequality, an embankment against socialisation. In Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand, anti-socialist forces have been

able to combine and reassert themselves against organised labour and arrest the march towards socialism. In these countries workers cannot afford to reduce their ability to resume their fighting posture in face of the attempt by conservative governments to undoing achievements. Labour governments. Trade union power and political solidarity of the working classes will have to be increased, they will have to be made conscious of the difference between socialist economy and social welfare economy, their spirit of revolt against the capitalist system will have to be reinvigorated, the agricultural masses will have to be made conscious of inadequacies, inefficiency and injustices of the capitalist system, and a forthright attack on economic inequality based on the ownership of capital will have to be launched.

The Praja Socialist Party, in its basic merger agreement, has affirmed that "non-violent class struggles such as satyagraha and strikes are also a necessary method of democratic action." It has condemned as anti-democratic such efforts of the Congress governments and leaders as were intended to deprive peasants and workers of their right of satyagraha and strike. The Party has always tried to secure justice to them through other peaceful means, but has never hesitated to organise and participate in satyagraha and strikes, when other available methods had failed.

The Congress Party upholds class collaboration and condemns the idea of class struggle. It holds that satyagraha has no place in a democratically organised State, that strikes have no justification in a system of planned production and distribution, and that industrial peace is needed for economic reconstruction.

It is easy to be eloquent over industrial peace, but it cannot be had in an economic system based on the exploitation of man by man. The type of industrial peace which the Congress Governments have been able to impose on industrial workers is hardly commendable. It has failed not only to secure to industrial workers a share in profit and management in industry but also to guarantee to them security of employment as well as fair wage and humane treatment. It has not been able to invoke in them the sense of security and fair treatment, and hence incentive for maximum production. Nor has it succeeded in inducing capitalists to be more concerned with the economic development of the nation than with their private gain. Industrial peace imposed by the Congress Governments is but a truce which has mainly benefited the capitalists and is bound to be short-lived as it has failed to resolve the basic conflict. The Congress Governments have not so far devised any scheme of equitable distribution of the national income, and has not been able to introduce a system of planned production in the industrial sphere. Our industrial development continues to be largely determined by the whims and vagaries of Indian capitalists. Under such conditions workers cannot reasonably be asked to forego their right to strike. So long as exploitation and oppression prevail,

satyagraha and strikes will continue to be resorted to by the suffering masses of India. Gandhiji never meant satyagraha to be used only against foreign domination. He advised its use even against economic exploitation and for the establishment of a classless socialist society. Free collaboration for the common good is always just and proper, but collaboration with injustice or at the cost of justice is hardly moral. If fight against injustice is moral, the class struggle of the oppressed classes against economic exploitation is also just. In uniting workers for the purpose of class struggle, socialism undoubtedly achieved something of permanent spiritual value, as it has raised a mass of men, whom it found in a state of brutalising servitude, to the level of combatants in the fight for rights and justice, aroused in them a sense of dignity and freedom and made human emancipation from oppression and exploitation possible. It is this class solidarity which compelled the capitalists to accept the idea of collective bargaining with organised labour on terms of equality.

To some trade-union leaders class struggle is essentially and exclusively economic in character. They believe in direct economic action under trade union leadership and have no faith whatever in organised political action.

The importance of class solidarity in the economic sphere cannot be overemphasised. A strong trade union movement is a prerequisite of success in class struggle. Day-to-day class struggle against exploitation and inhuman treatment can be carried on only under trade union leadership. Sabotage may be an expression of workers' enmity against capitalism, but it hardly adds to their strength, solidarity and morale, while the constant efforts at deceit, entailed in many forms of sabotage, have a vitiating effect upon the morale of the workers, the destruction and irritation caused by them tend to alienate intermediary classes, and hence to isolate organised labour from the rest of the community. Peaceful strikes are, no doubt, valuable means to compel capitalists to yield to organised labour their legitimate demands and to add to the vigour of class struggle. But by themselves they are not sufficient to liquidate capitalism, or to secure to workers general social recognition of their economic rights. For that the conquest of political power by the toiling masses is very necessary. Without effective political programme and organisation of their own, the working class movement may function as a countervailing power in the economic sphere and as a pressure group in the political sphere, but it cannot have any effective voice in determining social objectives and in transforming the economic order.

Some socialists condemn rigid constitutionalism, and hold that only an armed insurrection can lead to socialism. Both rigid constitutionalism and armed insurrection have to be condemned. Democratic means cannot be identified completely with constitutional parliamentary means. They do include peaceful means of

resistance such as strikes and satyagraha. The success of parliamentary means requires as much economic solidarity as political solidarity of workers. Without the former the latter can hardly be achieved. Fabianism became a vital force in British politics, only when it was interlinked with the trade union movement, and only to the extent it cast off its prejudices against workers' struggles. Even in democratic countries with strong constitutional traditions, the possibility of unconstitutional counter-revolutionary activities cannot altogether be ruled out. Capitalists may refuse to remain loyal to constitutional procedure when its application may lead to the liquidation of their economic power. So democratic socialist forces may have to face an unconstitutional counter-revolution not only through constitutional means alone but also through peaceful and non-violent direct action such as satyagraha and strike.

It cannot, however, be maintained that democratic means which include parliamentary struggle have not in any way advanced the cause of socialism, and that violent means alone are effective to bring about socialist transformation. Terroristic action and conspiratorial violence are only infantile maladies of anarchism and frustration. They are condemned by responsible socialist leaders of all shades of opinion and do not form part of socialist strategy. Nowhere in the world has democracy succumbed to a revolutionary insurrection of socialist character. Working classes have always preferred democracy to chaos and foreign aggression, and have, therefore, invariably supported democratic governments against insurrection and foreign aggression. Between the two world wars democracies had no doubt succumbed to counter-revolutionary insurrections of fascist character in certain European countries. But this must serve as a warning to those who talk of a socialist insurrection in a democratic country. It indicates that the cause of the socialist revolution can be best served by strengthening democratic forces, that the call of insurrection in a democracy is likely to weaken people's faith in the democratic process and split democratic forces, and thereby strengthen the anti-democratic counter-revolutionary forces.

From all this it is obvious that it will not be wise on the part of Indian socialists to strive for a violent insurrection. The Indian Constitution is basically democratic in character, is broad-based on universal franchise, and guarantees civil liberties which, in spite of all its limitations, provide sufficient freedom to the socialist movement to grow steadily through peaceful democratic process. The universal franchise may turn out to be an instrument of emancipation. Firstly, because it provides socialists with a means, second to none, of establishing close contacts with the mass of the people, of educating them in the socialist solution of Indian problems, of exposing the hypocracies of different political parties, and of consolidating different sections of the working people—industrial workers, peasants, agricultural labourers, middle class intellectuals and handicraftsmen—in a strong socialist party. Secondly, be-

cause it will enable socialists to capture seats in the legislatures and from that forum to arraign the government for all their sins of omission and commission and to defend rights and liberties of the toiling masses. And ultimately because through universal suffrage a strong socialist party can capture political power which may be used to promote the cause of the socialist revolution.

It may be contended that democratic traditions are not well rooted in the country, that Indian capitalists cannot be trusted to play a democratic game, that the Congress Governments are not consistently democratic and have often ridden roughshod over democratic ways, that the democratic process is likely to be slow, specially in an India steeped in conservatism. Though all these contentions are more or less true, none of them justifies Indian socialists to be undemocratic. They simply impose on the Indian socialist movement a democratic task which requires it to be consistently democratic. Where it is a question of the complete transformation of the social organisation and that of the transference of power and responsibility to the toiling masses, they themselves must grasp what is at stake and must also be in it. For that, long and persistent work among the masses is unavoidably needed. There are no shortcuts to a socialist revolution. Those who do not vote for socialism cannot be trusted to support the socialist insurrection. The call for an insurrection is no reply to a defeat in elections. It is not wise to blow hot and cold with democracy and insurrection. To mobilise democratic forces in favour of the socialist movement we will have to be consistently democratic and therefore peaceful and non-violent, will have to assure democratically minded Indians that we stand for democratic socialism, have no intention to impose any dictatorship, are determined to realise our objective through democratic means, to pursue democratic ways, to establish healthy democratic traditions in the country and to abide by democratic decisions. Democratic socialism cannot obviously afford to be indifferent to democratic forces. It is its historic task to lead them to socialist democracy. To establish a democratic socialist order, it is necessary to interlink democratic forces with socialist forces and infuse both with democratic socialist spirit. As a matter of fact, class struggle can lead us to a democratic socialist society, classless and casteless society, only when the struggle is informed by principles of democracy and equality. In this connection it must also be remembered that India cannot be converted into China or Viet Nam, even if we wish. In India, we have a strong central government which can claim loyal support of the central army and democratic support of a large section of the people. It will not, therefore, be possible for any socialist insurrectionary force to establish its authority in any particular pocket and from that pocket slowly to envelop the whole country. Nor can it be maintained that an insurrection is necessarily the shortest and easiest route to a socialist regime. For ten years after the Bolshevik Revolution, economic conditions in the Soviet Union were much worse than they had been under the Czarist regime.

Though the importance of parliamentary work cannot be overemphasised, non-parliamentary work deserves equal, if not greater, attention, specially at the initial stages of the socialist movement. The latter covers a wide field. It includes education, organisation, construction and struggle. People are to be educated in socialist theory and the socialist solution of Indian problems. The permeation of new thought is necessary for combating conservatism and producing a mental climate for social change. Adequate grounding in socialist theory is needed to enable the working classes to distinguish the socialist society from the Welfare State and to strive for the former even at the cost of certain immediate comforts. A clear vision of, and deep conviction in, final objectives are absolutely necessary to save the socialist movement from reformism and opportunism.

Special attention will have to be paid to organisational problems. Success needs strong, well-knit, vital political organisation. While it must encourage initiative at lower units of organisation and enable them to discuss and communicate their views on the policy and resolutions proposed to be adopted by higher bodies, the need for a disciplined functioning of the Party must not be lost sight of. Discipline is the life-breath of an organisation. Without the former the latter cannot be sustained, much less achieve its objective. So the spirit of discipline is to be infused in the members of the Party. A revolutionist's spirit of defiance requires to be balanced by self-discipline and loyalty to the cause and the party. Discipline is a prerequisite of success in a revolution. Without a party possessing the general confidence of the people, it is impossible to wage the struggle with success. And it will not be possible for a party to win such confidence unless its workers are devoted, heroic, self-sacrificing, honest and possess moral earnestness and deep human sympathy along with the spirit of revolt against social injustice. All these virtues are to be inculcated in active workers. They must also remember that the purity of means is as necessary as the purity of ends. Evil means can never lead to good ends. Fair ends require fair means. Adherence to certain human values and standards of conduct is necessary to achieve our objective. Workers are to be drawn from all sections of the people, as well from the peasantry and intellectuals as from industrial workers and agricultural labourers. These workers are to be so imbued with the socialist spirit that they will under all circumstances prefer the socialist cause to their personal or sectional interests, bind different sections of the people in a common fraternal bond, educate them in socialist ideology and guide them in their march towards democratic socialism.

We, socialists, must also strive for the solidarity of the working people. Peasants, industrial workers and other working classes are to be encouraged and helped not only to consolidate themselves into strong economic class organisations but also to develop close co-operation amongst themselves. Conflicts between different

sections of producing masses are to be composed and all possible effort should be made to imbue them with the spirit of common mission against exploitation and domination. Industrial workers should be helped to realise that peasants' co-operation is necessary for the conquest of political power through democratic process. And peasants should be encouraged to understand that they are also being exploited under the capitalist system, and that only under the socialist system they can have effective voice in determining the industrial policy and can claim joint ownership of the industrial wealth of the country. Co-operation and mutual consultation between different class organisations and the Praja Socialist Party should be encouraged and the two should be so interlinked that the former remain free from the control of the latter.

Socialist youths should be organised on cultural basis and their organisation should be interlinked with the Praja Socialist Party. They should study and permeate socialist ideology, cultivate socialist morality and promote socialist culture. They must also organise the study of social, economic, political and cultural problems of the country and search for their socialist solutions. They should organise sports and games, and hold youth festivals and other cultural activities, and thereby promote free co-operation, develop their physical and mental faculties and make their life healthy and joyful. They must cultivate respect for social property as well as for dignity of labour and human personality, must be ever ready to serve suffering humanity, and must desist from undignified and anti-social behaviour. They must so act, live and work as to be builders of the democratic socialist society. Youths of today are leaders of tomorrow. They must, therefore, cultivate the quality of leadership. But both the youth movement and the socialist cause are bound to suffer in case the former assumes independent leadership. The socialist youth movement, to grow on right lines, must be an integral part of the socialist movement and must function under the guidance of the Party.

Working classes cannot be expected to suffer meekly oppression, exploitation and injustice till a socialist party acquires political power and relieves them of their sufferings through social legislation. Even in a democracy they must reserve to themselves the right of peaceful resistance against specific economic grievances and acts of injustice which authorities had failed to rectify. This resistance may be in the form of peaceful strikes and demonstrations, satyagraha and civil disobedience. Each act of struggle should be such as to pass the tests of the general aims of society and should, as far as possible, be so conducted as to enable the people to realise that the socialist system is the only real and permanent solution of oppression, exploitation and injustice. Socialist workers must take a leading part in these class struggles and their problems. It is their duty to organise peaceful resistance against injustice, to guide the struggles of oppressed humanity and

to suffer with them in their sufferings. Such sufferings will deepen their love for suffering humanity and their determination to end exploitation and injustice, and will bind them with the common people in a bond of mutual confidence, so necessary for the socialist revolution.

Socialist workers must also attend to constructive work amongst the people. It will enable them to maintain their contacts with, and win the confidence of, the toiling masses, to train themselves and the people in the task of reconstruction through collective social efforts, to test their abilities in creative work and to ensure the proper foundation of a new society after the conquest of power. This constructive work, if properly conducted, will also provide them socially necessary work in dull periods of a revolutionary era, and thereby save them from frustration and degeneration as well as from illplanned struggles.

The party system is an integral part of parliamentary democracy. No party can afford to function on non-party basis on all political and economic issues. A party owes to itself to lay emphasis on distinctive features of its policy and programme and expose fallacies and inadequacies of the stands of other parties. A party which fails to secure adequate support of the electorate has to play the role of opposition. It is then its duty to voice unattended urges and needs of the people, to expose corruptions and inefficiencies of administration and offer its own solutions as an alternative to those pursued by the government. In opposition a party must so behave as to convince its supporters that it deserves the renewal of their confidence and to assure many others that it can be trusted with administrative responsibilities. Opposition must be vigilant and vigorous as well as dignified and discriminative. If it is lukewarm, it loses the confidence of its supporters; if it is undignified, it fails to command public respect; if it indulges in wild accusations which cannot be substantiated it is discredited and fizzles out. Parliamentary struggle should obviously be such as to pass the tests of the general objectives of the party. They must not be intended to spite the government at all costs, but to promote its own policy and programme.

The Praja Socialist Party is required to keep all these facts in mind, and so behave and conduct itself in opposition as to assure the people of its bona fides and capacities and to deepen the faith of peasants and workers in its devotion to their cause and interests. It is a vanguard of the socialist movement; and it is its duty to uphold its objectives with courage and determination, and treat with disdain such co-operation with others as may in any way harm their promotion. It must preserve inviolate the independence of the socialist movement, and must not allow itself to be confused with other parties and movements. It may, however, co-operate with them on specific issues and in constructive work, provided suitable conditions for such co-operation exist. In the legis-

latures it may join hands with other opposition parties in exposing inefficiencies, corruptions and high-handedness of the Government. But it shall never allow itself to be dragged in controversies likely to harm the cause of socialism or the interests of the people. It will always be prepared to offer such co-operation to the Government in parliamentary work as is expected from opposition parties in democracies, provided the Government is prepared to extend to it courtesies and rights due to an opposition party. It may claim participation in public affairs at par with opposition parties in democracies. But it will neither allow itself to be duped by general appeals for national consolidation, nor fritter away its energy in futile talks on needs of co-operation. Such appeals and talks keep people at a low level of political consciousness, give an impression that the opposition party is a superfluity and tend to weaken the tempo of opposition. The Party will indeed try to cultivate a temper of peaceful relation among different political parties so that politics of conflict may be worked out without violence.

The Praja Socialist Party is conscious that it can implement its policy and programme properly when it is returned to the legislature concerned in an absolute majority. So it does not like to assume power unless it commands the confidence of the majority of the electorate. But in India where more than two parties exist, it is just possible that the Party may be the largest party without being in an absolute majority. In such conditions, the Party may form the government as a necessity and try to implement its policy and programme. However, in the event of grave national emergency, the Party may agree to join a coalition government at the Centre. The question whether such an emergency exists shall be determined by the National Executive and such a decision is to be ratified by the General Council. The Praja Socialist Party shall not enter into an electoral adjustment with the Congress, the Communist Party or any communal party.

The Praja Socialist Party is conscious of the fact that the ultimate objective cannot be achieved by its government in one term of office. The first step on the road to socialism will have to be determined both by resources in man and money and by the immediate needs of the people. The Socialist Government must for obvious reasons attend to immediate needs and give necessary priorities to them. But its policy and programme must be informed by the ultimate objectives and must be such as may lead us to the ultimate goal. They shall, therefore, be based on fundamentals of democratic socialism.

CHAPTER VIII

SOCIALIST CONCEPTION OF MORALITY

To socialists moral law is human, social, historical. It is human, because it is concerned with human life, is rooted in human nature and is a product of human needs and experiences. It is social, because it is a rule of social discipline and is a psychological creation of social man. It is historical, because it has evolved with human experience and knowledge and changed in response to historically determined needs and conditions.

A real human morality requires full social consciousness which is possible for most of the people in a real human society which is free from exploitation, oppression and domination, and consequently from antagonisms which generate class consciousness. The possibility of a purely human sentiment in intercourse with others is with us today exceedingly impeded by a society founded on class antagonisms and class supremacy in which we move. It cannot be doubted that in a society based on exploitation and servitude human nature is degraded. And the present economic system based on the motive of profit not only pollutes moral atmosphere and breeds moral degradation, but also corrupts and disintegrates ethics along with other social sciences. It has divided society into classes, generated class struggle and compelled social thinkers to be partisans.

The problem of morality must, therefore, be socially approached. This social approach does not deny the need of conscious human efforts for the moral development of the individual and the society. It only insists that as man is by nature social, and moral virtue is the essence of the social nature of man, an individual can develop moral personality in society and in proper social atmosphere, and his efforts must not be purely psychological but essentially social in character. It also maintains that as circumstances make man, just as much as man makes circumstances, there must be a simultaneous change in human activity and the social system to secure moral development. That even in adverse social atmosphere some have developed their personality considerably cannot be doubted. But they are exceptions to the rule and only prove that humanity can produce men who can lead and help their fellow beings in developing potentialities latent in men and circumstances. But there is no reason to doubt that the force which acts upon the minds of the people and leads them to act depends very largely upon circumstances, and that the bulk of humanity can lead real human life and develop moral personality in a good social order.

The moral code of a class society cannot claim to comprehend moral urges of the entire community. It no doubt embodies certain moral norms which are of enduring value and can claim to command the general acceptance of all classes. But many impor-

tant moral rules reflect only social needs of the dominant class. They are intended to justify and uphold social institutions and ways of life on which its dominance is based. They are buttresses of inequality and domination. As class conflict develops, the oppressed class revolts against them, exposes their iniquities and inconsistencies and refuses to be bound by them. It enunciates new moral principles based on its urge for freedom and equality, and demands their general social acceptance and their embodiment in the moral code of community. Thus, a class society is faced with conflicts of moral ideals, a new orientation of moral order becomes imminent at a certain stage of social development. And if then the outlived moral standards remain in force, the society is faced with evil effects of contradictions between its ruling morals and the life and action of its members.

In this conflict socialism stands by the oppressed masses. It condemns oppression and domination as immoral, and strives for the establishment of the new moral order based on equality and liberty, the basic moral urges of the common man.

In a real human society, sociality will be sufficient to make a man moral, but in a class society, where class consciousness dominates social consciousness and selfishness overpowers the sense of social responsibility, sociality needs to be sustained by the revolutionary urge of justice to the oppressed and the exploited. Without this urge a capitalist cannot rise above the morality of exploitation and a petty bourgeois cannot save himself from frustration, vacillation, and even reactionary outbursts. As a matter of fact, unless this urge is very strong and sufficiently revolutionary, a man may find it difficult to withstand temptations to serve his personal ends. This urge will also have to be stimulated in members of exploited classes. But for this urge it would be difficult for them to stand the temptations of immediate gains and withstand privations and sufferings which have to be faced in any struggle against the dominant class. This is also necessary to enable them to avoid conflicts amongst themselves and to appreciate properly the value of an equalitarian society free from exploitation. In their case this urge can be strengthened by the feelings of class solidarity and by the conviction that this revolutionary urge is founded on their class interests and is necessary for their emancipation from oppression and exploitation. This revolutionary urge against injustice to be really moral must not obviously be confined to revolt against others' injustices. It must also cause repulsion against one's own injustices.

This revolutionary urge of justice is not a hothouse growth. It needs for its development the experience of struggle against exploitation and devoted service to suffering humanity. And it needs for its success, besides a keen insight into the objective situation, moral earnestness, deep human sympathy, disciplined behaviour, loyalty to the cause and faith in organised efforts. A

revolutionist's spirit of defiance requires to be balanced by self-discipline, which needs subjective efforts for self-cultivation. Self-introspection and self-criticism are needed to maintain emotional balance which we tend to lose in the midst of conflict. The conservation of energy demands the guidance of constructive thinking. Without proper intellectual guidance, feelings may run riot and cause all sorts of conflicts, disharmonies and confusion.

The moral evolution needs as much moral attitude as participation in moral activities. Socialists must resist such old moral rules and forms as tend to perpetuate inequality, domination, exploitation and oppression. But they cannot afford to ignore all general rules of moral behaviour. This will not only afford reactionaries an opportunity to malign the socialist movement as immoral, but also make it difficult for the party to maintain even decorum and decency in its ranks. Rules of democratic behaviour shall have to be scrupulously followed and the democratic way of life to be promoted. Socialists will also be well advised to live moral ideals for which they stand. In a class society it is not possible to practise in life all moral ideals of classless society. But some approach to them is possible. Even some proximity to them will not only elevate socialists' moral stature but also enable them to win public confidence for themselves as well as for the cause dear to their heart. Such public confidence is essential for the conquest of power through democratic process.

The moral ideal of democratic socialism is in a sense militant and revolutionary, as it is intended to serve as the motive power of class struggle, as a means to collect and inspire the forces of revolutionary classes and as a powerful lever to overthrow the existing social and economic order. But this moral ideal is not purely negative. It no doubt challenges the universal moral validity of the established moral code and strives against certain socially recognised moral norms and rules of conduct. But it has also certain positive content, on which its moral claim is chiefly based and new socialist morality is to be founded.

Democratic socialism believes in the moral evolution of man through the ages and regards socialist morality as its fulfilment. It resolves contradictions and conflicts in moral ideals, vitalises moral principles of essentially humanistic character and preserves such traditional forms as are not inconsistent with socialism. It develops new principles of the socialist world out of the principles of the existing world.

Socialist morality is real human morality, free as it is from all compromises with egoism, class antagonism, exploitation and domination. It is founded on humane sentiments of socialised humanity. It is based on the conviction that the proper growth of humane sentiments and moral personality requires the social

climate of free co-operation and equality as well as facilities of decent cultured life.

Swatantra, Samata and Lokahit (liberty, equality and common good) are the basic principles of socialist morality. These principles commanded the adherence of Rishis, Acharyas and prophets of ancient times, Saints and Sufis of the middle ages as well as revivalists and revolutionaries of the modern age almost all over the civilised world. On their basis some sort of spiritual humanism tended to be evolved in India. But in the past its evolution was retarded by social norms of hierarchical nature imposed on us by economic conditions of feudal character. Today, our economic conditions require and permit a revolutionary change of socialist character in our economic order, and our social conditions require differentiation of our moral norms from religious forms, composed as our society is of different religions. It is our duty to build socialist morality through the creative synthesis of democratic and socialist norms of humanist character, with spiritual humanism differentiated from religio-social norms of hierarchical character.

Socialist morality so evolved shall stand for the reorientation of life, social and personal, on the basis of human consciousness and fellowship, the respect for human personality and the dignity of labour, national freedom and international peace, social justice and universal good, individual liberty and free democratic co-operation, the progress of humanity and the integrity of personality. The integrity of personality will consist in the sublimation of impulses and harmonisation of emotions in the promotion of 'Lokahit', broad human outlook and its creative realisation in action, the spirit of public service and the sense of responsibility, the courage of conviction and strength to stand against social evil against all odds and circumstances. The sublimation and harmonisation of impulses and emotions will enrich human life with universally recognised moral qualities, such as equanimity, courage, fortitude, truthfulness, frankness, fearlessness and compassion. Socialism wishes each to cultivate these moral qualities.

To socialists moral personality consists in the capacity on the part of an individual for making social good his own. To them moral action is a free action contributory to social good; moral freedom is the liberation of all powers of men for the social good; and moral life is only possible in a society in which man seeks the realisation of true joy in association with others and so promotes his betterment as a constituent of social good. Socialist morality stands for man's self-perfection to be attained through Lokahit. It requires a man to pursue not only the ideal of his own self-perfection but also necessarily that of the perfection of others who are constituents of the same moral order. It stands for liberty, not in the sense of want of restraint, but in the sense of facilities for free and happy life. It upholds equality not in the sense of uniformity in personal attainments, which is neither possible nor desirable,

but in the sense of equal consideration of the basic human needs and claims of the free development of the human personality of each individual. It stands for the fraternity of all which, it maintains, is possible only in a society free from the distinction between owners and producers, and is to materialise in the common enjoyment of a common equipment provided by common and co-operative efforts. It insists on the dignity of labour as a constituent of the respect for human personality, because physical personality is an inseparable constituent of human personality, manual work like mental work is a creation and expression of human personality, and in a society mostly composed of manual workers the dignity of human personality cannot be adequately realised except in terms of the dignity of labour. When socialists participate in the struggle against injustices of exploiting classes, they fight against iniquities of feudalism and capitalism and strive for a free moral order. When socialism insists on industrial democracy and humane conditions of work, it is because they are prerequisites of free moral life.

CHAPTER IX

SOCIALIST CULTURE

Socialism is not only an economic movement but also a cultural movement. It strives as much for real human culture as for a new economic order. It regards culture, like social ethics, as human, social and historical. Culture is but an expression of the social in man, cultural heritage is the collective achievement of human efforts in history. Cultural principles are products of history, results of human experience, embodiment of human urges and needs. A cultural pattern is a way of life under certain physical environment and historically determined social conditions.

Geographical environments shape cultural forms and colour cultural outlook. Our ways of life are no doubt rooted in the soil and cannot be uprooted from it. New ways of life cannot be introduced without these being acclimatised to geographical environments. But the geographical factors represent rather limiting conditions than immediate determinants of the social situation. Much more than geographical environments, social environments and conditions mould our culture and ways of life. In spite of all their diversities people living together unconsciously begin to develop certain common social characteristics and cultural outlook. And there is a close correspondence between cultural and social conditions, between cultural progress and social evolution. Culture is considerably shaped by vital social forces and economic interests. A cultural pattern must respond to social development. Cultural lag is harmful to social growth. Any hiatus between culture and social needs causes split personality as well as disharmony in social life.

In a class-ridden society social consciousness is warped by social prejudices, caused by the conflict of economic interests and socio-economic affinities. In such a society while some cultural values are the common heritage of the entire community, many cultural values reflect class interests and prejudices. Cultural standards of different classes vary and a conflict in the cultural sphere develops. The dominant social class is able to impose upon society a cultural pattern suited to its needs and urges, and upholds it firmly with a view to perpetuating its social and cultural hold over society. For long the oppressed class under the spell of the dominant cultural pattern mimics the ways of the dominant class, *and submits to its norms almost as divinely ordained.* But in *course of time*, as class consciousness develops, the oppressed class *challenges old norms and forms*, demands the recognition of human values conducive to the promotion of its interests, and urges the transformation of the cultural pattern in correspondence with new vital social and economic forces and its own cultural requirements.

Faced with this cultural conflict, the protagonists of the old cultural order become offensively defensive. They uphold it in the name of the genius of the people, ascribe social ills and cultural chaos to deviation from old ways and plead for reversion. But the idea of cultural reversion is suicidal. It is positively reactionary in character. It causes life to stagnate, militates against social progress and breaks down under the stress of social dynamics.

The Congress concept of composite culture, which claims to offer a solution of the cultural integration of the Indian people, is both static and reactionary. It lacks vitality and dynamism and fails to comprehend the cultural requirements of modern India. It upholds certain medieval cultural norms and forms as salient features of the Indian culture on the ground that they commanded in the past the adherence of both Hindus and Muslims. Thus, an attempt is made to impose an essentially feudal culture on a society intended to be democratic. No wonder the Congress concept of composite culture fails to inspire modern India, and is treated with contempt by all those who stand for the democratisation of our ways of life and for the building up of a new culture based on the working people's social urges of socialist character.

Socialism is definitely opposed to perpetuating norms and ways of hierarchical character in the name of composite culture. It is pledged to strive for the social recognition of cultural needs and urges of the common people and for the evolution of a real human culture for the classless society free from domination and exploitation as well as from class conflicts and snobbishness. Such a culture shall be a creative synthesis of humanistic elements of Indian culture and democratic socialist elements of Western culture.

Social humanism so evolved should be the basis of the socialist culture in India. Social humanism does not insist on

uniformity in forms and expressions. It will seek harmony and unity in variety. Cultural autonomy and equality in all forms shall be guaranteed to all citizens. They will have equal right freely to profess and practise their religion, and to organise educational institutions and cultural associations for the study and promotion of their religion and literature. The culture, language, traditions and special interests of the minorities shall be treated with consideration, and no law shall be passed which in any way would militate against them. No minority, whether based on religion, community or language, shall be discriminated against in any matter. All minorities would be allowed equal and full participation in all spheres of social, economic and political life. In places where a minority forms a considerable proportion of the population, the State shall provide facilities for imparting fundamental education to their children though their language upto the secondary stage. But the children of the minorities will have to study the national language as well as the official language of the State concerned so that they might play their creative role as citizens. The Praja Socialist Party hopes that the minorities on their part will come forward and participate fully in the life of the nation, and work creatively to establish the socialist civilisation which alone offers a lasting solution of the problem of minorities.

The unity of labour and culture is a basic principle of the socialist culture. It values human labour as a creative force of human personality and regards the refinement of conditions of its expression as essential for the cultured life for multitudes of humanity. Culture, it holds, must be shared by the entire community and should be equally accessible to all. Adequate facilities should be provided to the common people for the development of their personality and the enjoyment of the cultural heritage of humanity. Art treasures must, then, cease to be private property. They should be nationalised and made accessible to all for study and enjoyment. All economic enterprises should be required to provide houses of culture for, and facilities for the cultural advancement of, their workers. Agriculturists should be encouraged not only to preserve the natural beauty of rural India but also to acquire and enjoy cultural accomplishments of humanity. Modern amenities of decent civilised life should be so extended to the people residing in rural areas that there may be real cultural integration of urban and rural India.

The problem of the cultural advancement of the tribal peoples and the removal of the cultural and educational lag between the advanced and backward castes is a special concern of the socialist movement. In the past, in many countries of the world nationalists tried to secure the cultural assimilation of the tribal peoples through the imposition of a cultural pattern which they considered to be national in character. These efforts not only failed to achieve the objectives but also in most cases retarded the cultural progress of the tribal peoples and exposed them to exploitation and encroach-

ments. Imposition generated inhibitions and hatred against the cultural pattern and tended to uproot the people culturally. Democratic socialism will, therefore, try to promote their cultural progress through the process of the fusion of cultures and adaptation to new conditions. Attempts shall be made to help them in working out a creative synthesis of vital elements of their indigenous cultures and the basic principles of socialist culture. Their cultural autonomy shall be respected, and to ensure it democratic regional councils shall be established, which shall have, besides usual municipal functions, powers of legislation and administration over tribal economy and socio-cultural affairs of tribal peoples. These regional councils will be encouraged and helped to introduce the modern amenities of cultural life and the advanced technique of production in tribal regions. The tribal peoples will, thus, realise and achieve their progress through their own constructive co-operative efforts with necessary encouragement and assistance of the State and advanced sections of the Indian nation. They will be able to evolve a culture which will be socialist in content, but retain such cultural forms and ways dear to them as do not militate against the spirit of the new culture.

India is a multi-lingual nation, misconceived as a multi-national State by Indian communists. Ethnologically, culturally and historically there are much closer ties between different linguistic units in India than those between different linguistic groups of Switzerland, which is acknowledged a nation by all competent authorities. There is no comparison between the socio-cultural structures of India and the Soviet Union, and therefore the analogy of the Soviet Union is not applicable to India. Under Czarist regime the Russian Empire was composed of many linguistic communities, most of which were in their socio-cultural structures poles apart from the Great Russian nation and were smarting under its domination. There was no attempt on the part of the Great Russian people to forge national unity with other linguistic communities of their empire, and so, on the eve of the Bolshevik Revolution, Russia was faced with conflicts of national liberation from the Russian domination. All this cannot be said of India. In their socio-cultural structures almost all important linguistic communities are alike. They share certain common cultural traditions and have made their own contribution to the common cultural heritage of India. This cultural unity helped the growth of national unity in course of a common struggle for freedom against foreign domination. So, the problem of the cultural autonomy of different linguistic groups of India is not a problem of international character. It is essentially a problem of the redistribution of India into constituent states and regional units in such a way as to ensure equal cultural autonomy to all, commensurate with their stature and requirements of national development.

Indian communists, who are very fond of Soviet analogies and who on that account glibly talk of the right of secession of

linguistic communities, must also remember that in the Soviet Union the demand for separation is treated as counter-revolutionary, and the right of secession is not conceded to all national units but to only such of them, less than ten per cent of the total number, as satisfy three important conditions—(1) the unit concerned is not situated in the middle of the Soviet Union, (2) the unit concerned is large enough to form an independent State, and (3) the region concerned is an integrated national unit. It must also be remembered that in the Soviet Union the Russian people are treated as the “elder brother”, and that the conception of the national character of linguistic communities is almost submerged in the idea of “the monolithic unity of the Soviet people”, increasingly stressed by Soviet statesmen.

We, socialists, denounce the right of secession of linguistic communities of India, but at the same time also refuse to accept any linguistic community as the elder brother and do not think in terms of monolithic unity. We stand for national unity on terms of equality of all linguistic communities. We say what we mean. So we do not think it proper to speak of the right of secession in one breath and to punish its demand as counter-revolutionary in another breath. We are convinced that members of all important linguistic groups are equal members of the Indian nation and that no group can in any way claim superiority over others. To us the claim of superiority is a negation of democracy, the denial of equality, the first fundamental principle of socialist society. The idea of monolithic unity of autonomous nations is, in our opinion, a contradiction in terms, and is possible only in a dictatorship which talks of autonomy but imposes rigid uniformity in all matters of importance. We have no doubt in our mind that a real international unity can never be monolithic in character. It cannot be compared with the rigidity and uniformity of a single block of stone shaped into pillar or monument, which the metaphor implies.

To promote the cultural unity and advancement of the Indian people, the Party will recognise Hindi as the common national language of India, but will also deem it its duty to promote equal advancement of all the regional languages. Steps will be taken to encourage their proper study even in States of which the regional language concerned is not the official language. At least in big States academies of Indian languages and literatures will also be established and other possible efforts will be made to promote cultural fellowship among Indians of different linguistic units.

Democratic socialism is convinced of the justice and urgency of the equality of sexes. Inequality is inhuman, and the cultural backwardness of the fair sex is retardatory. Great social changes are impossible without the feminine ferment. Socialism is, therefore, opposed to such cultural norms and forms as have relegated women to a dependent and secondary place in society and denied to them opportunities and facilities of cultural

advancement. It wishes them to enjoy the status of equality and independence. It not only recognises their rights to employment in services of all grades and types and to equal pay for equal work, but also insists on their equal cultural advancement and on their claim to social equality in all respects. It treats motherhood with consideration, regards child and maternity welfare as joint responsibility of the family and the community, and acknowledges women's equal right to education and to participation in the cultural life of the nation.

Culture, happiness and joy will, thus, cease to be a monopoly of the privileged few. Every one shall have the means to decent cultured life and be entitled to happiness and joy in association with others. The development of each shall be the condition of the development of all, and man shall be the real master of his destiny. His creative genius shall have free expression, and both artisans and artists shall be equally encouraged to add to human happiness and joy. None will have to pamper to vagaries, vanities and vulgarities of the rich. Nor shall any one be required to submit his art to the fiat of the State officials the way it is done in the Soviet Union. Folklores which are free expression of the joys, sorrows, urges and genius of the common man will in a socialist society be treated with much greater respect and command much greater attention of socialist artists than the art developed in feudal courts. This does not mean that the art and architecture of feudal and capitalist eras shall be allowed to decay. Every attempt shall be made to preserve them and develop their technique in response to the new urges and needs.

Artists and litterateurs shall continue to be guided in their work by the trinity of truth, human good and beauty, to use our ancient terms Satya, Shiv and Sundar. Art will mean realism, will uphold truths as well objective and social as subjective. It will symbolise human happiness and joy realisable through free collective efforts. It shall no doubt stand for harmony of life with nature. But it shall also stand for harmony in society realisable through the harmonisation of emotions and that of social forces in a social system free from class conflicts, exploitation and domination. The three shall be treated as inseparable constituents of an organic whole. Therefore, truth shall be so expressed as to promote happiness and harmony. No attempt shall be made to mix up happiness and joy with falsehood and discord. Nor shall beauty be devoid of truth, social happiness and virtue. A synthetic expression of the three in an atmosphere of freedom is needed to produce art of permanent value.

Indian art is largely symbolic in character and may continue to be so in socialist India. But then art will cease to symbolise archaic mythological traditions in meaningless imageries. It will symbolise human values and social ideals of free society as well as

social urges and humane sentiments of its members in proper understandable forms, and typify a personality striving against social injustices and his own evil propensities and devoted to the promotion of general happiness and development.

Soviet leaders strongly hold that "the problem of typicalness is always a political problem." They thus assert the claims of politics to determine the standards of arts and literature and force artists and men of letters to follow a pattern fixed by a political junta. Democratic socialists are definitely opposed to Soviet political dictatorship in the field of culture. They are convinced that one of the worst calamities that can befall art is to be levelled, forced into a single fixed pattern even though it be the best. This obliterates the individual, produces stereotypes, hinders the development of creative thought and eliminates the joy of the quest.

For the birth of a new society which is democratic in character and free from domination and exploitation, the system of education will have to be radically transformed. Knowledge is power; its universalisation is therefore necessary for equality and justice. So in a socialist society culture and education will cease to be the monopoly of the privileged classes and every citizen will receive the benefit of modern education. Education will be gradually made free even upto the university stage for every child; and every boy and girl will receive education according to his or her aptitude and ability and needs of the community. Sons and daughters of classes and communities which have so far been deprived of the benefits of education will receive special attention. They will not only receive free tuition but also be given maintenance grants from the State. No profession will any longer remain the close preserve of any special caste or section of the community. Talented young men and young women of the poorer sections of the community will be paid stipends and maintenance allowances to enable them to receive specialised training in different professions. Adult educational institutions shall be established for peasants, workers and other producers close to their homes and places of work. These institutions will make provisions for vocational training as well as for cultural and educational activities. As genius exists in all strata of society and there is no race or class of human beings who are not capable of assimilating the cultural heritage of mankind, the universalisation of education will contribute to the general cultural advancement of the nation, increase its intellectual capital and enable it to be at par with other civilised nations of the world. More emphasis will be laid on the teaching of science and technology. Vocational schools and colleges of technology will be opened in large numbers to serve the needs of an underdeveloped country. But the teaching of science will be combined with the teaching of humanities so that technical education may be imbued with a social purpose and noble ideals. Physical, moral

and intellectual education will be given their due place in the scheme of education. Attempt shall be made to cultivate in youths initiative, civic consciousness, social awareness, habit of co-operation, respect for democratic ideals and traditions and the feeling of sanctity for public property and social responsibility. With this end in view, along with theoretical training in citizenship, healthy extra-mural activities on democratic lines shall be promoted under the guidance of the teachers imbued with aforesaid moral ideals. To infuse the entire youth of the community with the democratic spirit and the feeling of national unity, it is also necessary that all should receive education in common schools. So special schools opened for sons of aristocracy and of high officials of the State will be abolished and the denominational and communal institutions shall be converted into common schools.

The unity of knowledge and work is a fundamental principle of socialist education. The mind is not in the attitude of passive, uncritical absorption of ideas and objects which senses chance to transmit to it. The source of knowledge is observational reality, which is an active process of experimentation, manipulation and critical testing. Education must not, then, be a process of pressing ideas upon pupils constrained to imbibe them. Theoretical education should rather go hand in hand with the productive labour and the actual manipulations of the objects by the pupils.

Such an education will have to be planned, bearing always in mind that the advancement of learning and research can be promoted only in an atmosphere of academic freedom, where teachers enjoy freedom of expression of thought and are respected in society and do not suffer from material wants. For the system of socialist education, society needs teachers who are not only specialists in their own branches of knowledge but also imbued with the spirit of the age and conversant with the aspirations and needs of contemporary life. It is their duty to imbue their pupils with the spirit of democracy, the love of liberty, the thirst for justice and the will to progress; and this mission requires corresponding virtues in them. In short, a teacher must have good education, a strong moral sense and enthusiasm for social service. Only then can he humanise the school, exercise moral influence over youths of the country, maintain discipline, and prepare youths for the fulfilment of the duties of democratic citizenship.

As a first step the Government should endeavour to wipe off illiteracy and provide free and compulsory fundamental education of eight years as soon as possible. It must also promote social education in democratic citizenship, open vocational institutions, organise technological education and scientific research on a wide scale and grant liberal stipends and maintenance allowance to talented youths of poor families. Special attention should be paid to the education of the children of tribal people and backward communities,

including those of scheduled castes. A scheme of education in all its detail is to be prepared in consultation with educationists of wide experience. Much has already been done in this direction. But more is needed. What is needed most is that the Government should make up its mind as to what programme of education it wishes to introduce.

CHAPTER X

INTERNATIONAL POLICY

Socialism is an international movement. It strives for a world of freedom, prosperity and peace; for a world in which men are free from economic, political and social bondage of men and peoples; for a world in which all human beings, irrespective of race, creed or sex, enjoy fundamental human rights and have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity; for a world in which each nation enjoys equal democratic freedom, all international disputes are settled through peaceful means, and human progress and co-operation are guaranteed. A world society based on the principles of freedom and equality and of voluntary co-operation between free peoples is the goal of socialism.

Socialism welcomes the upsurge of national consciousness as a stage in the emancipation of nations, and is ever prepared to support national democratic forces struggling for political freedom. Socialism is opposed to imperialism, because the latter is motivated by the spirit of exploitation, has entailed poverty, misery, degradation and indignity on the dependent peoples, has generated an attitude of racial arrogance amongst European colonists, has strengthened capitalist forces in imperialist countries and is one of the main sources of international unrest and conflicts. The continuance of colonialism and imperialism is thus a challenge to democracy, a menace to socialism and a constant threat to world peace.

The socialist movement, therefore, demands an early liquidation of colonialism and imperialism in all forms and lends its support to the freedom movement of dependent peoples. Self-determination, hitherto regarded by imperialist nations as a privilege, must be exercised as a right by colonial and dependent peoples. The will of the people should be the basis of the authority of the government, and every one should be guaranteed equal right to participate in the government of his country and to promote and share its prosperity. All people, irrespective of the race and the group to which they belong, should be entitled to live a full and free life on the basis of the fullest equality.

The policy of racial segregation and supremacy which is imposed by European colonists in Africa, is unjust and inhuman. It is based on the "master race" theory and is essentially fascist in character. It is being maintained by means of vicious laws and cruel despotism which has produced intense racial bitterness, bursting out into violent upheavals and acts of terrorism. The entire continent is being increasingly caught in a vicious circle. Genuine movements for national freedom and democratic reform are met with a reign of terror. This provokes terroristic acts, which are in turn met with the declaration of a state of emergency and the launching of total war against the African people. Four to five million Europeans cannot justly dominate and exploit about two hundred million Africans. Persistent struggle for freedom and against economic enslavement will surely continue until European colonists cast off their racial arrogance, renounce their policy of segregation and claims of supremacy and recognise the absolute equality of races. They must also consent to the reorganisation of political life on the principle of the equality of man, irrespective of colour and creed, and to the creation of social conditions which restore human dignity, equality and freedom to every African and enable him to lead a decent cultured life.

The Socialist International, mostly composed of European socialists, has resolved to make every effort to impel metropolitan governments to assist the achievement of democratic self-government in all the colonial territories as soon as possible, and to promote conditions necessary for the purpose by fostering economic, social and cultural development, by combating racial discrimination and antagonism and by establishing democratic institutions. It has also condemned strongly the *apartheid* policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa, pledged itself to give full support to democratic socialists in all dependent territories and to co-operate with all genuine democratic movements for the achievement of self-government. It has also called upon socialist parties in all countries to give their fullest support for the establishment of a world plan for mutual aid under the auspices of the United Nations Organisation.

Asian socialists fully support these objectives. But Asian socialists are not satisfied with the "go slow" freedom policy of European socialism. Even many European socialists are convinced that this policy has only involved them in conflicts with freedom movements and has enabled communists to malign democratic socialism. It has begun to be recognised that the slow building up of African institutions and standards will not succeed, because events had already run too far ahead. Democratic socialists cannot afford to be so afraid of communism as to deny to dependent peoples even their fundamental human rights. Communism cannot obviously be contained by repression which generates bitterness and misery conducive to its growth. The grant of self-determination is the only way to evoke in dependent and colonial peoples

faith in democracies and democratic ways. African and Asian nationalists detest Soviet authoritarianism as much as domination of imperialism. And their spirit of independence can be relied upon to combat Soviet expansionism and dictates, provided it is allowed free expression and is not haulted and antagonised by political oppression and military terror.

National freedom is only a means to human freedom. The struggle against colonialism must aim at the emancipation of the people from all types of domination and exploitation as well as at the realisation of social and economic equality and the establishment of a democratic socialist society. Indian socialists, dedicated to the cause of democratic socialism, pledge themselves to give full support to democratic socialists in all dependent territories in their endeavour to establish a democratic socialist order and to ensure to the working people means of happy life and cultural advancement.

Vast numbers of the world population still suffer from periodic famines, extreme poverty, illiteracy and disease. These inhuman conditions are incompatible with the socialist principle of equality of opportunity for individuals and communities. They are grave obstacles in the way of the development of universal democracy and of human progress. They are a moral and economic danger to the entire humanity. They are a threat to peace. The eradication of extreme poverty which constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere is as much the moral responsibility of the more advanced countries as it is of those who live in less developed areas. Democracy, prosperity and peace require the fullest utilisation of natural resources, an increase in the productivity of the underdeveloped areas, and the closing of the gap between the living standards in different parts of the world.

Socialists wish advanced countries to extend to underdeveloped countries technical aid and financial assistance. But they do not contemplate with equanimity any enlargement of private investment or any increase in private investors' control over the economy of underdeveloped regions. Nor are they prepared to approve of any loan or aid given with a definite political motive. They reject plans which serve the narrow short term interests of industrial nations and which conflict with the fundamental principles of equality in relations between different peoples. They reject attitudes of superiority towards less fortunate peoples, and seek to build up a wholly new relationship based on mutual respect and co-operation to meet common economic needs.

Socialists, thus, welcome only such foreign technical aid and financial assistance as are based on the conviction that the eradication of poverty is the common need and responsibility of the entire humanity and that the greater resources of advanced countries place a duty on them to assist the underdeveloped countries and thereby promote world peace and economic stability

as well as human happiness and welfare. Socialists agree with other internationalists that with a view to avoiding any embarrassment inherent in the flow of aid or loans from one country to another, it is necessary that the foreign capital requirements of the underdeveloped countries should be met through an international institution organised under the direct control of the United Nations.

India is today a semi-developed country and is in need of foreign technical aid and financial assistance. Indian socialists are fully prepared to co-operate with the United Nations in an international project for the economic advancement of underdeveloped countries and to pool India's resources with the rest of the world for the purpose.

The present international order is iniquitous, weak and imperfect. It is based on the principle of the sovereignty of the States, gives full recognition to the imperialistic domination of powerful States over hundreds of millions of people. It binds every nation to the peaceful settlement of international disputes and authorises the Security Council of the United Nations to enforce peace against an aggressor. But the organisation is too weak to compel any powerful nation. It cannot alter materially the differences in economy and armed strength of different nations and has ceased to evoke confidence in its capacity to maintain peace in the world. Still, the United Nations is the main symbol of international solidarity and a mechanism of international co-operation. It stands for certain human ideals and values, is promoting social, cultural and economic progress of humanity through a network of specialised agencies, and is the only world organisation that can be made a fit instrument of peace.

Socialists, therefore, stand for the United Nations, uphold the principles and objectives of its charter, and wish to strengthen that organisation and its various agencies in all such efforts as might lead to a world of freedom, equality and peace. For this purpose they would like the constitutional structure of the United Nations to be so revised and its authority to be so extended that it may serve as an effective mechanism of world peace. There should be no permanent seats in the Security Council. Nor should any nation be entitled to veto a majority decision of the Council. The membership of the United Nations should be open to all nations willing to join it. It should not be beyond the competence of the United Nations to take up colonial questions and those relating to national minorities which suffer from the loss of their civil liberties and fundamental rights. Membership of the United Nations should entail the renunciation of the right to form power blocs of military character in the name of collective self-defence, and impose an obligation to renounce the policy of expansionism in all forms. Only such a reformed United Nations Organisation can bring about necessary disarmament, and become an agency of collective security acceptable to all the peoples of the world.

To ensure peace it is also necessary to ban the use of nuclear weapons and the increase in expenditure on armaments and to secure general disarmament, specially of those countries which are armed to the teeth.

Socialists strongly hold that peace and liberty are indivisible, and therefore wish the United Nations to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. They welcome the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and strongly urge that International Law should make its implementation obligatory on all States. Socialists condemn the Soviet Union's opposition to the Declaration in the General Assembly of the United Nations, based on the grounds that the Declaration "ignored the sovereign rights of democratic States" and made for "interference in the internal affairs of the State". Such an opposition was definitely anti-socialist in character. Socialism has never rated the sovereignty of the States so high as to sacrifice human rights and fundamental freedoms at its altar. Even though this Universal Declaration is incomplete in certain respects, it is essentially democratic in character and its implementation is sure to advance human freedom and happiness.

In the midst of the Second World War the Soviet Union and the United States along with Great Britain pledged themselves to continue their united action even after the termination of the war for the organisation and maintenance of peace and security; the Soviet Union dissolved the Comintern as 'a token of friendship towards the Western Allies' and entered into twenty years' treaty relations with Great Britain and France; and the United States and Great Britain helped the Soviet Union with arms, ammunition and other necessary supplies. Still, the unity of purpose and action, in so far as it was achieved during the war, was forced upon the principal allies by the overwhelming necessity of combating the Axis bid for world domination. And so, soon after the war, the Soviet Union and the United States completely fell out. The United States assumed the role of world leadership, regarded totalitarian regimes as a danger to international peace and to her security and pursued the policy of containing communism. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, brought Eastern Europe within her sphere of influence, established the Cominform and accused the United States of a bid for world imperialism.

Today, the world situation is characterised by the creation of two powerful blocs—the American bloc and the Russian bloc—and their struggle for world domination. The American bloc claims to be a champion of democracy, while the Russian bloc claims to be a champion of socialism. But these claims are hardly true. The American bloc does not stand for political democracy consistently. It includes within its fold Salazar's dictatorship in Portugal, is committed to uphold imperialism in North Africa and

has almost invariably come in conflict with national democratic forces of Asia struggling for freedom and against Western imperialism. The United States has allied itself with Franco in Spain, Syngman Rhee in Korea and Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa. In the United States the suspicion of extra-territorial loyalty has led to McCarthyism and the persecution of even innocent loyal American citizens. Her diplomacy is crude, her ways are imperialistic, her attitude is domineering and her ambition seems to be political and economic domination of the entire world. She refuses to treat her allies as her equal and is definitely hostile to democratic socialism. Nor can world communism claim to be a friend of socialism. It is subservient to the Soviet Union which suffers from Russian chauvinism, authoritarianism and big power complex and dreams of world dictatorship. It has been so inimical to democratic socialism as to have supported Hitler against German social democracy, to have organised insurrection against socialist forces in Indonesia struggling against Dutch imperialism, to have led forces of disruption in Socialist Burma and to ruthlessly crush democratic socialists in Eastern Europe. The Soviet Union is so intolerant of even honest differences as to purge communist leaders, to exclude Yugoslavia from Cominform and to try to undermine Mao Tse-tung's leadership in China when he chose not to follow Stalin's way in conducting the Chinese revolution. In her lead she is so selfish as to advise British and French communists to advocate revolutionary defeatism against Nazi Germany when she chose to be friendly to Hitler, to advise Indian communists to disrupt the freedom movement against British imperialism when she chose to be friendly to Great Britain. Her attitude to colonialism varies with the requirements of her diplomacy and becomes militant only when she is otherwise engaged in a conflict with the imperialist power concerned. Colonial peoples are, thus, a pawn on the chessboard of Soviet diplomacy. Nor can her allies and friends expect better treatment.

The extension of the American influence to all parts of the earth will make the American system "almighty on this planet" and will not allow socialist parties to develop and eventually challenge the supremacy of capitalism. On the other hand, the incorporation of the world in the Soviet sphere will put the Kremlin-controlled communist parties in power everywhere and destroy the democratic and socialist forces.

Democratic socialists all over the world are unhappy over the growth of world tension. They detest Soviet expansionism, its dictatorship and ruthlessness, as well as American arrogance, its claims of world leadership and its hostility to socialism. They condemn both communists' extra-territorial loyalty and American witch-hunting. They are absolutely opposed to American alliance with the Franco regime of Spain and with anti-democratic forces in Asia. They will like the Soviet Union to withdraw her forces from the Eastern European countries and allow them to live as free nations and to agree to the unification of Germany on the basis of

free elections. They will also like the United States to withdraw her opposition to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. They stand for the reduction of armaments and the peaceful settlement of all international disputes and problems. They wish both the Soviet Union and the United States to end the cold war.

European socialists are mortally afraid of Soviet expansionism and ruthlessness and feel convinced that the Soviet aggression cannot be faced by different European democracies separately or even jointly without the assistance of the United States. They, therefore, stand for collective security of European democracies in close association with the United States. This has compelled them to partnership in the American bloc and compromises with the American way, and involved them in emotional and organisational crises. A substantial section of European socialists revolts against this position and in certain cases leaders are able to carry with them their parties only with a narrow majority.

Asian socialists, on the other hand, almost unanimously stand for non-involvement in the conflict between the American and Soviet blocs, favour peace through negotiation, and wish to do whatever they can for the strengthening of genuine peaceful forces of the world. In their programme of peace, the first priority is assigned to the liberation of colonies, the equality of all races, and the economic development of underdeveloped countries.

Indian socialists have always advocated the policy of active and positive neutrality and favoured the formation of the "Third Force", composed of all those countries and social elements that want to keep aloof from the conflict of power-blocs and desire peace, freedom and justice. They are gratified to note that under different names the idea of the "Third Force" is supported by almost all other Asian socialist parties. The Party reaffirms its solidarity with them and its organisational unity with the Asian Socialist Conference in their policies of peace as well as in the cause of democratic socialism. The Party, however, strongly feels that effective pursuance of the policy of the "Third Force" is possible under the present international circumstances only within an organisation that is never suspected of any alignment on the side of any power bloc and succeeds in maintaining a distinct international identity. It does not therefore favour any move or proposal for organisational unity between the Asian Socialist Conference and the Socialist International, composed mostly of European Socialist Parties. But as in the interest of World Socialism, close co-operation between the two organisations is of utmost importance, the Party wishes them close relationship through joint action to the extent possible consistently with its fundamental foreign policy.

India's policy of peace demands that she should come out of the British Commonwealth which still maintains colonial domina-

tion and racial discrimination and which strategically, economically and politically is a part of the American bloc.

After independence India has naturally acquired increasing importance in world affairs and contributed to the solution of many international problems. But the Praja Socialist Party is constrained to underscore the failure of the India Government to solve vital problems affecting our nation, such as Kashmir and Goa. Its policy with reference to Goa has been weak and ineffective, and suffered from swift turns. Its refusal to allow the citizens of the Indian Union to offer satyagraha for the political freedom of Goa, the bulk of whose citizens are ethnologically and culturally identical with Indian citizens of Maharashtra and Konkan, is rightly condemned by the Indian public opinion of all shades. It has not so far succeeded in securing from the Union of South Africa and Ceylon even bare justice to persons of Indian origin in these countries. The pursuit of general aims at the neglect of immediate and urgent issues may lead to widespread disillusionment.

The Party has already condemned the formation of the South East Asia Defence Organisation intended to draw South Asian Governments in the orbit of the American bloc and South East Asia in the war area. It equally condemns the Baghdad Pact and is constrained to note the growing international tension in Western Asia. It earnestly hopes that Asian powers would abstain from such arrangements of collective defence as may serve the interests of big powers and draw it into the orbit of the American or the Soviet bloc.

The Praja Socialist Party stands for India's close relationship with neighbouring States as well as for collective leadership in which both big and small powers of Asia have the weight of authority. It will not like any single power, be it China or India, to emerge as the sole dominant power in Asia. It feels convinced that the world has suffered too much and too long because of the domination of two or three big powers, and that, therefore, it is our duty to see that this catastrophe is not repeated in Asia.

The Praja Socialist Party stands for the liquidation of European political and economic domination over Asian countries, but condemns the slogan of Asia for Asians. It is definitely opposed to the suggestion of Asian exclusiveness, cultural, economic or political. It does not wish the people of Asia to confine themselves in a narrow continental shell, to suffer from Asian chauvinism or to cherish inferiority complex against Europe. We can ill-afford to cut ourselves adrift from the life currents of other parts of the world. It is our duty to be ever ready to exchange ideas and experiences with the rest of the world and promote world co-operation in the interest of universal peace, freedom and prosperity.

The Praja Socialist Party feels that the five component principles of Panch Shila are the basic norms of international life, which need implementation rather than reiteration. Their proper implementation demands the liquidation of imperialism and expansionism in all forms as well as equal freedom to all nations to shape their destinies in their own way. To assure the world of the bona fides of their intentions it is necessary for the Soviet Union to dissolve the Cominform and for all big powers to disavow intentions of world leadership, to liquidate military blocs and to allow smaller nations and political communities to enjoy full democratic freedom. The co-existence of different socio-economic polities is an unavoidable necessity of the world as it exists to day. But this is but a transitional phase of social evolution. The world must ultimately move towards increasing approximation to universally accepted values of civilisation. The Praja Socialist Party feels convinced that democratic socialism provides the best synthesis of human values.

The salvation of the world lies in democratic socialism; and only those who have a firm faith in democracy and socialism can be the vanguard of the new movement for world peace.

CHAPTER XI

DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM, COMMUNISM, INDIVIDUALISM.

Socialism for which we stand is democratic because:

1. it is opposed to hierarchical conception of society;
2. it is opposed to the control of social power, political or economic, by a single person or a privileged class in any form of despotism, dictatorship, feudalism or capitalism;
3. it is opposed to imperialism and foreign domination in all forms and recognises entire humanity's right of democratic freedom;
4. it favours democratisation of social relations and behaviour;
5. it establishes the control of the working people over social, economic and political powers;
6. it provides for self-government in all social, political and economic affairs;
7. it evolves order on the basis of liberty, i.e, free participation of all concerned;

8. it provides for democratic decentralisation of authority and responsibility;

9. it ensures social equality and justice by securing priority to the needs and claims of full physical, mental and moral development of all;

10. it promotes social happiness, of which individual happiness is a constituent;

11. it regards the people as a source of authority and recognises their right to rebel in case a single person or a minority group or class attempts to seize or retain control over governmental institutions or social power;

12. it favours the democratic organisation of peace and international relations.

Thus, democratic socialism is definitely opposed to communism, which is essentially totalitarian, authoritarian and managerial in character. In the Soviet Union, which continues to be regarded by Indian communists as their fatherland, Marxism has been converted into administrative socialism, proletarian revolution has been converted into managerial revolution, and the dictatorship of the proletariat has been converted into the dictatorship of industry over peasants and the dictatorship of a junto of the communist party over the entire working people. International socialism is being used as a tool of Soviet diplomacy and expansionism. All this is by no means socialism.

Indian communists claim to be Marxists but they are invariably the tools of the Soviet Union. Their policy is determined and dictated by its fiat and varies with the changes in its diplomacy. While Marxism required socialists and the proletariat to co-operate with bourgeois nationalists in the struggle for national freedom, Indian communists under Soviet leadership tried to sabotage it on the ground of the bourgeois leadership of the Indian National Congress. The Quit India movement was actually condemned as fascist in character mainly on account of the Soviet Union's alliance with Britain during the war.

In 1948, the Communist Party of India withdrew its support to the Congress Government which had been extended earlier by its General Secretary, accused the Indian national bourgeoisie of collaboration with imperialism and charged the Congress Government of representing the class interests of the national bourgeoisie, that is the industrial bourgeoisie. And it also advocated a new democratic front under its leadership, composed of an alliance between the working class, the peasantry and the progressive intelligentsia against the combine of imperialism, feudalism and the bourgeoisie headed by the Congress Government. The democratic front was required to strive for the nationalisation of big industries,

big banks and insurance companies, removal of Big Business from strategic economic points and control of profits in the industries in private hands. But, in 1951, the Communist Party of India absolved the national bourgeoisie of the charge of collaboration with imperialism, accused the Congress Government of being an agent of British imperialism, withdrew its programme of the nationalisation of Indian industries and capital, and invited national bourgeoisie to its democratic front against the Congress Government.

In 1948, the Communist Party under the leadership of its General Secretary, Ranadive, thought of the proletarian insurrection and in its hope communists committed acts of violence and terrorism. Ranadive refused to acknowledge Mao's leadership and pay any attention to his strategy of revolution. But, in 1950, under the guidance of the Cominform, Ranadive was removed from the General Secretaryship and it was decided by the Communist Party that the Chinese pattern of revolution be substituted for the Russian pattern. In urban areas a peaceful policy began to be pursued and in certain selected rural areas violent activities were intensified. In 1951, the Communist Party realised that Indian conditions did not permit a successful application of Mao's pattern of revolution and the futile attempt was given up. It then decided to organise a strong constitutional opposition against the Congress Government and for the purpose entered into all sorts of alliances with all sorts of disgruntled groups and politicians. These alliances and rapprochements were motivated by its desire to secure the greatest possible Indian support for the Soviet foreign policy against the American bloc. But even when it proclaimed its conversion to democratic means, it continued to reaffirm secretly its faith in underground violent action and conspiracies. In 1955 when Molotov proclaimed that India was not a colonial country and Bulganin praised the progressive character of Nehru's Government, the Communist Party of India ceased to think of the Democratic Front as an alternative to the Congress Party for the government of the country and decided to play the role of the pressure group as well in favour of Nehru's foreign policy and progressive principles of the Second Five Year Plan as against the reactionary policies of the Government. The Central Committee of the Communist Party has recently resolved: "its immediate task is to establish the broadest unity in action, of masses following all parties including the Congress, to win the demands of the people and to create mass sanction for the adoption and implementation of progressive policies." The Party, however, proposes to "emphasise the necessity of the establishment of a Government of People's Democracy" in course of its general propaganda and ideological political activity among the masses.

The Praja Socialist Party is definitely opposed to Communists' subservience to the Soviet Union and detest oscillation between democratic means and conspiratorial terrorism. It is

consistently democratic and intends to work for the social revolution through democratic means. A socialist movement, it holds, can under no circumstances be satisfied with the role of a pressure group. It must strive for the conquest of power and the socialisation of industries. Nor is the Praja Socialist Party prepared to regard a people's democracy of the communist pattern as a real democracy, because it denies free elections, does not allow parties other than the communist party to function on the popular plane and lacks independence from foreign control. The Party regards India as the fatherland of Indian peasants and workers and educates them in socialist patriotism which requires them to defend their fatherland against foreign aggression and to strive jointly for building the classless and casteless socialist society and prosperity of the people. Socialist patriotism, for which we stand, is free from national chauvinism and the spirit of imperialism and expansionism in all forms, including the spirit of the dictatorial leadership over the working people of any other country of the world. It, thus, differs from the communist patriotism of the Soviet Union which has compromised with Russian national chauvinism and narrow pan-slavism, stands for the world dictatorship of the proletariat under the leadership of the Soviet Union, requires the communist parties of the world to subordinate their will to the supreme claims of Soviet patriotism, and is ever prepared to adopt imperialist ways in the name of combating bourgeois imperialism. Socialist patriotism is also definitely antagonistic to capitalist patriotism, which goads the people to support the economic imperialism of their bourgeoisie, requires the working classes to forsake the class struggle and sacrifice their class interests at the altar of the claims of national solidarity.

Indian socialists believed in common front against British Imperialism and strove and suffered with others for the liberation of the country. Socialists are prepared to form a united democratic front with national bourgeoisie against foreign aggression. But they see no reason why they should sacrifice the cause of socialism at the altar of a united front with national bourgeoisie. Is national bourgeoisie so progressive and democratic that it will be willing to form a united front with the proletariat against the Congress? Will class collaboration between industrial capitalists and the working classes help the cause of socialism? Our reply to both these questions is definitely negative.

Socialism is definitely opposed to the individualistic conception of society, which assumes that each individual is an independent whole with private pains, pleasures and interests, and explains existing social arrangements as contractual obligations to which each individual commits himself out of his own interest. Absolutely self-sufficient individual, free from inter-relationship with others, is only a figment of imagination. Man is essentially a social being, possessed of social impulses and pervaded by society. Society is an element of life. It is in us, in some degree in all, in the highest

degree in the greatest of us. It is just as "real" as any or all of its members. Although it does not exist apart from the individuals who constitute it, it cannot be completely reduced to them. It is an order out of which individuals arise and acquire their very individuality.

Pure "egoism" is an absolute abstraction of intellect. Man is also moved by social impulses. Social sympathy is ingrained in him, is a part of his life, and by his nature he tends to sympathise and to behave socially with others. If today most of us are less social, it is not because egoism is the dominating characteristic of our nature. It is mainly because most of us are very easily influenced by social environment, because the tone of society as a whole is determined largely by the character of the motives to which the social system makes it strongest and most pervasive appeals, and because the present social system stimulates the motive of personal gain most. So it is not human nature but the social system which is to be blamed for the dominance of selfishness in our behaviour. If we are tired of social anarchy and the disintegration of personalities caused by egoism and selfishness, it is our duty to so reshape our social system that it stimulates our social impulses most, brings into play such incentives as may be able to dispense more and more with those incentives which are of such a sort as to set man against man.

Society must, then, repudiate individualism, get rid of a system in which every one's personality is disintegrated or even annihilated by transmutation into a single function of personal gain and over-stimulation of anti-social egoistic impulses. This does not mean the disregard of the individual and his personality. It only means that individualism, narrowly egoistic, retards the growth of personality, and that individuality can attain its supreme development only in the highest common social efforts. Individuality that democratic socialism recommends tends to the good of the whole and is valuable as a means to that end. Democratic socialism does not wish the individual to be lost in a crowd or submerged in a totalitarian regime, but to realise himself and his happiness in free association with others, which is possible only in a decentralised socialist democracy. In such a society, it holds, man will enter into the realm of freedom, all will have full and equal facilities for the development of their faculties and personalities, and real human morality based on liberty, equality and free co-operation will prevail.

LIST OF DELEGATES ATTENDING

ANDHRA

Kondaiah, G. C.
Sastry, K. S.
Satyanarayana, S.
Sriramprasad, L.
Sundar Rao, V. L.
Tilak, K. S.

ASSAM

Uma Sarmah

BIHAR

Ajazi, Mansoor Ahsan
Ambastha, Lakshmi Prasad
"Anil", Parmeshwar Roy
Arya, Bhuvaneshwar
Arya, Nityanand
Azad, Baldeo
Azad, Lakshman
Baidik, Kulnand
Bishnudeo
Chhathu Ram
Chand, Abul Hayat
Chand, Abu Naima
Charan, Umeshwari
Chaudhary, Janardan
Chaudhary, Jatashankar
Chaudhary, Mahabir
Chaudhary, Phekan
Chaudhary, Ramkaran
Chaudhary, Ramkishore Roy
Chaudhary, Ramnarayan
Chaudhary, Suryanarayan
Danilalji
Das, Rameshwar
"Dehati", Gopal Singh
Desai, Mahesh
Dubey, Jagdish
Ganga Sharan Sinha
Ghosh, Basanta Chandra
Gopal Krishna
Gupta, Kedar Nath
Gupta, Ramratan Prasad
Gurmaita, Deonarayan
Hiralalji
Hussain, Muslim
Jha, Jairudra
Jha, Jayadeo
Jha, Ramesh
Jha, Rudra Narayan
Jaiswal, Bharat Prasad

Kapoor, Lakhan Pal
Keshavnarayan
Khan, Arman
Khan, I. H.
Kuwar, Parmeshwar
Manjoy Lal
Mehta, Tulsidas
Mishra, Bigeshwar
Mishra, Jagannath
Mishra, Kabilashpati
Mishra, Ramlakhan
Mishra, Triloki Nath
Mitra, Ram Bahadur
Mukherji, Gyanendra Bihari
Mukhia, Kaushik
Munshi Ram
Nand Lal
Navaikishore
Ojha, Ramjanma
Palit, Rajkumar
Pandey, Bholanath
Pandey, Sheopujan
Paswan, Balbodh
Paswan, Sheonandan
Prasad, Ayodhya
Prasad, Bhagwat
Prasad, Deonandan
Prasad, Ganga
Prasad, Lakhan
Prasad, Nageshwar
Prasad, Nanaku
Prasad, Dr. Radha
Prasad, Rajeshwar
Prasad, Rambaran
Prasad, Thakur
Raghavan, G. V.
Rahman, Abdul
Raman, Shambu Sharan
Roy, Raman
Roy, Ramdeo
Rashul, Gulam
Sah, Biswanath Prasad
Sah, Jagannath Prasad
Sao, Ramkumar
Shaki, Abul Sattar
Sharan, Janaki
Sharan, Satruhan
Sharma, Mohanlal
Sharma, Mohit
Sharma, Nakuldeo
Sharma, Rajendra
Sharma, Ramswarup
Shishirkumar
Shukla, Brajkumar

Shukla, Jogendra
 Shukla, Radhamohan
 Singh, Avadh Bihari
 Singh, Badri Narayan
 Singh, Baidyanath Prasad
 Singh, Baikunth
 Singh, Basishta Narayan
 Singh, Basudeo Prasad
 Singh, Bhagdeo
 Singh, Bhupal
 Singh, Biswanath (Saran Dist.)
 Singh, Biswanath (Muzaffarpur Dist.)
 Singh, Brajbihari
 Singh, Brajkisore Narayan
 Singh, Chandrabhal
 Singh, Chandrika Prasad
 Singh, Deopati
 Singh, Devanandan
 Singh, Devendra Parsad
 Singh, Dinferan
 Singh, Dwarika
 Singh, Dr. Gaya Prasad
 Singh, Gita Prasad
 Singh, Harihar
 Singh, Hitnarayan
 Singh, Indradeo
 Singh, Jagdish
 Singh, Jamuna Prasad
 Singh, Janakdeo
 Singh, Kailash Prasad
 Singh, Kaushlender Prasad Narayan
 Singh, Madan Mohan
 Singh, Mani Lal
 Singh, Mithilesh. K.
 Singh, Mudrika
 Singh, Murlidhar
 Singh, Muneshwar Prasad
 Singh, Musafir (Muzaffarpur Dist.)
 Singh, Musafir (Shahabad Dist.)
 Singh, Pradeep
 Singh, Priyabrat Narayan
 Singh, Narsingh Narayan
 Singh, Narsingh Narayan
 Singh, Ram
 Singh, Rajendra
 Singh, Rambilas
 Singh, Ramchandra
 Singh, Ramdeo
 Singh, Raghubansh Narayan
 Singh, Ram Jaigopal
 Singh, Ram Jayapal
 Singh, Ram Janma
 Singh, Ramnagina
 Singh, Ramprasad
 Singh, Ramsurat
 Singh, Ramswarup
 Singh, Sadanand
 Singh, Sahadeo
 Singh, Saryu Prasad
 Singh, Sheopariksha
 Singh, Sitaram (Patna Dist.)
 Singh, Sitaram (Shahabad Dist.)

Singh, Suraj Narayan
 Singh, Sureshwari Prasad
 Singh, Satishchandra Prasad
 Singh, Swaran
 Singh, Yuvraj Prasad
 Singh, Uddham
 Sinha, Basawan
 Sinha, Mahabir Prasad
 Sinha, Mahamaya Prasad
 Sinha, Sabhapati
 Tanti, Chini Bass
 Thakur, Bishnu Prasad
 Thakur, Karpoori
 Thakur, Nageshwar
 Thakur, Sushil Narayan
 Tiwari, Ramadhar
 Tiwari, Ramanand
 Tiwari, Srinivas
 Tiwari, Subedar
 Triveni Kumar
 Tulmohan
 Verma, Baijnath Prasad
 Yadav, Yogendra Prasad

BOMBAY CITY

Adur, Prabhakar
 Alvares, Peter
 Dalvi, Vasant
 Dandavate, M. R.
 Desai, Bhaskar
 Dighe, Sharad
 Harite, B. D.
 Hatle, B. R.
 Jadhav, Maruti
 Joshi, Eknath
 Joshi, Manubhai
 Khanolkar, Vasant
 Kulkarni, Raja
 Kulkarni, V. B.
 Kurmi, Kedarnath
 Mehta, Asoka
 Mehta, Mathuradas
 Mhatre, G. M.
 More, Madhu
 Mule, Anna
 Mule B. N.
 Patel, Shanti
 Paurana, Mulji
 Phatak, D. G.
 Pimputkar, M. B.
 Prabhu, Mahadev
 Sawant, B. A.
 Shah, Sevanti
 Sharma, Kamaldev
 Singh, S. Hajara
 Thakur, Dinesh
 Todankar, Manohar
 Trikamdas, Purshottam
 Varaskar, V. B.
 Vasavda, P. R.
 Vichare, A. B.
 Wadhavkar, Suryakant
 Waman, K.

BOMBAY-KARNATAK

Patil, T. Rayangouda

DELHI

Anand, A. P.
Bhatia, Prem Pal
Chauhan, Ram Saran
Das, Bhagwan
Idris, Mohd.
Kripalani, Sucheta
Sharma, Omprakash
Singh, Manmohan
Singh Raghuvir
Vasisht, D. D.

GUJARAT

Bahdoorbhai, D.
Desai, Suresh
Joshi, Suresh
Mehta, Sanatkumar
Mohite, Shivajirao
Patel, Nandjibhai Maganbhai
Patel, Uttambhai Harjibhai

HIMACHAL PRADESH

Pal, Hira Singh

HYDERABAD

Abbaiah, K. R.
Buchiah, M.
Ethirajuloo, V.
Jagannadham, P.
Kabra, Vijendra
Kasim, Mohd.
Mishra, H. P.
Moorthy, N. Satyanarayana
Naidu, Ram Moorthy
Radhakrishna, G.
Rajamallu, K.
Rao, R. Hanumantha
Rao, Maturi Narasimha
Rao, A. Satyanarayana
Rao, Dr. Upendra
Rao, K. Vasanth
Reddy, M. Rama
Reddy, P. Uma
Somayajulu, K.
Tammewar, Ramnath
Venkatesam, J.

KASHMIR

Abdullah, Mohd
Bhatia, Gurcharan Singh
Gupta, Jagdish
Rakha Mal, Ram
Sarraf, Omprakash

MADHYA BHARAT

Singh, Jagjit

MADHYA PRADESH

Baghel, Hari Prem
Baghel, Dr. Khubchand
Banpurkar, V.P.
Bante, Hariram
Bende, Srikrishna Nilkant
Dandekar, V. S.
Dekate, Dr. P. M.
Dorlikar, Rambhau
Dube, Dr. K. L.
Faruqui, A. R.
Gokhale, M.S.
Gupta, Shiv Adhar
Gupta, Sohanlal
Kakirwar, Shyamrao
Kaluramji
Kamath, H. V.
Kashmiri, Shyamnarayan
Mishra, Mahesh Dutt
Mishra, Ramsevak
Nagarkatti, K. N.
Nigam, Baburao
Shende, Ganpatrao
Sikarchi, Ganga Bhisen
Singh, Niranjana
Sirajuddin, Kazi
Toksia, Navalchand
Varma, Brijlal

MAHARASHTRA

Ansari, Harun
Arnalkar, V. M.
Bapat, S. J.
Bhave, J. V.
Dahale, Shankarrao
Garud, Gajanan
Jadhav, Y. N.
Joshi, S. M.
Kanade, Dr. D. S.
Kocharekar, Shyam
Limaye, Anutai
Limaye, Madhav,
Mahajan, Shivram
Maharaj, Dulichand
Mankar, P. L.
Medhekar, C. S.
Meher, Maruti
More, Shyamkant
Narkhede, K. M.
Ogale, G. J.
Patil, Shivaji
Pawar, Kishore
Pradhan, M. S.
Rajhans, B. N.
Shaha, Navnit
Shetye, Bhai
Shikhare, S. R.

Shinde, Datta
Suryavanshi, Janardan
Tamhane, Datta
Warty, S. G.

MANIPUR

Singh, N. Kula
Singh, W. Kulabidhu
Singh, S. Somorendra

MYSORE

Bhagwan, B. G.
Bheemanna, B.
Hemmiga, Vedanta
Kambanna, B.
Kenchappa, K.
Maheshwarappa,
Rangappa, M

PEPSU

Gupta, Jagdish Chandra
Karamchand
Tandon, Kewal Krishna
Tiwana, Teja Singh

PUNJAB

Ahmed Din
Bhasin, Prem
Chadha, Tilak Raj
Jaya Gopal
Rao, Begraj Singh
Sehgal, Ram Krishan
Shaida, Somprakash
Sindhu, Dr. Dayal Singh
Singh, Harbhajan
Singh, Harcharan
Singh, Jaswant

RAJASTHAN

Bhagwati Devi
Chowdhary, Rajendra Singh

SAURASHTRA

Mehta, Jaswant
Paneri, Narbheshankar
Patel, Ramnik
Shah, Pratap T.

SOUTH KANARA

K. R. Karanth

TAMILNAD

Anthonisamy
Appasamy, K. C.
Arumugam, N. P.
Arunachalam, V. A.

Gopalaswamy, G.
Kandaswamy, M. A.
Krishnan, S.
Lingaswami, K. N.
Namasivayam, M.
Pommayan, C.
Ponnuswami, N.
Radhakrishnan, V. R.
Ramraj, N. S.
Subbiah, A. C.
Subramaniam, A.
Subramaniam, A. V.
Subramaniam, S. B. V.
Swamy, R. V.
Vadivelu, G. A.
Veluswamy, P.
Venugopal, G.
Vijayalakshmi, S.

TRAVANCORE-COCHIN

Hussain, M. A.
Kunju, P. K.
Menon, K. Krishna
Nair, Somasekharan
Parameswaran, C. K.
Pillai, Attingal Gopala
Pillei, Thundathil Kunjukrishna
Sebastian, C. L.
Sreedharan, Ponnara G.
Sreedharan, N. V.
Sivaramabharathi, K. A.
Verghese, B. C.

UTKAL

Acharya, Mihir Kumar
Bag, Maheshwar
Bahinipati, Harihar
Behera, Akulananda
Bhuyan, Manoranjan
Dalai, Jagannath
Das, Amarendra Kumar
Das, Banka Bihary
Das, Pradipta Kishor
Das, Prasanna Kumar
Das, Rabindramohan
Das, Sarangdhar
Dwivedy, Surendranath
Ghose, Anil Kumar
Hansda, Harachand
Maharana, Banamali
Mohanty, Natumohan
Naik, Baisnab Charan
Naik, Sudam Charan
Pal, Prasanna Kumar
Pandit, Biswanath
Patnaik, Dibakar
Raut, Kartik Chandra
Raut, Sarchidananda
Sahu, Biswanath
Sahu, Narayan Prasad
Samantrai, Rajkishore

UTTAR PRADESH

Abbasi, Rabbani
 Abdul Ali
 Ahmadi, S.
 Agnihotry, Devi Dutt
 Ansari, Faridul Haq
 Ansari, Iqbal Haidar
 Bachchan Lal
 Bajpai, Ayodhya Prasad
 Bhattacharya, Prof. K.K.
 Chandrasekhar
 Chaubey, Ganga Sahai
 Chaubey, Tirath Raj
 Dixit, Ganga Sagar
 Dixit, Ramnath
 Dube, Jagannath
 Dube, Rajdhar
 Dwivedi, Krishna Dutta
 Dwivedi, Motilal
 Dwivedi, Rajendranath
 Gahamari, Bishwanath Singh
 Gupta, Fagu Prasad
 Jagannath Mall
 Jaiswal, Saligram
 Joshi, D.P.
 Hari Prasad
 Kaushik, Pitamber Nath
 Kripalani, J.B.
 Kunwar, Ram Briksh
 Madhav, Beni Prasad
 Misra, Ramakant
 Mittal, Satya Prakash
 Onkarnand Swami
 Pandey, Dalsinger
 Pandey, Devi Prasad
 Pandey, Jagdish
 Pandey, Jugal Deo
 Pandey, Kesari
 Pandey, Mata Prasad
 Pandey, Ram Prasad
 Pandey, Ram Sundar
 Pathak, Baijnath
 Prasad, Baijnath
 Prasad, Raj Banshi
 Rai, Bishram
 Rai, Gauri Shankar
 Rai, Raj Banshi
 Rai, Ramayan
 Ram Dutta
 Sachan, Rewati Raman
 Saxena, Gopal Krishna
 Seth, Damodar Swarup
 Singh, Anandeshwar Prasad
 Singh, Bishwanath
 Singh, Chandrapal
 Singh, Genda
 Singh, Madanpal
 Singh, Manager
 Singh, Mata Bikh
 Singh, Nagendranath
 Singh, Raghunath
 Singh, Rajwant
 Singh, Ram Deo

Singh, Ram Nagina
 Singh, Ram Sundar
 Singh, Sahadeo
 Singh, Sagar
 Singh, Sharada Prasad
 Singh, Sheo Murty
 Singh, Siddhanath
 Singh, Siddheshwar Prasad
 Singh, Triloki
 Singh, Virendra Bahadur
 Shanti Shiromani
 Sharma, Ramadarsh Rai
 Sharma, Ram Ratan
 Sharma, Udit Narayan
 Shastri, Baijnath
 Shastri, Brajkishore
 Shastri, Jagannath
 Shastri, Rajaram
 Shastri, Prof. Raja Ram
 Shastri, Ramdhari
 Sohan Lal
 Srivastava, Gyanendra
 Srivastava, Omprakash
 Tandon, Balkrishna
 Tiwari, Bhola Nath
 Tiwari, Braj Narayan
 Tiwari, Narayan Dutt
 Tiwari, Vindheshwari Prasad
 Tripathi, Rajeshwar
 Umashankar
 Upadhyaya, Madan Mohan
 Vakil, Iqbal Hussain
 Varma, Bankey Bihari
 Varma, Ramji
 Varma, Ram Subhag
 Varma, Tarkeshwar Nath
 Vidyarthi, Dinesh Chandra
 Visharad, Mangal Deo

VINDHYA PRADESH

Gurudeo, Rajendra Kumar
 Joshi, Jugal Kishore
 Naik, Laxmi Narain
 Sher Kan, Mohammed
 Shastri, Bhagwan Dutta
 Singh, Jang Bahadur

WEST BENGAL

Auddy, Ramkrishna
 Aich, Santimoy
 Banerjee, Adhir
 Banerjee, Mohini
 Banerjee, Sibnath
 Banerjee, Sujit
 Bhattacharya, Mahadev
 Bhowmick, Sabita
 Bose, Ajit Kumar
 Bose, Manindra Nath
 Boes, Bidyut Kumar
 Bose, Debu
 Bose, Jitesh
 Bose, Pravat Kumar

Chanda, Sudhansu
 Chatterjee, Mohit
 Chakravarty, Biresb
 Chakravarty, Nani
 Chowdhury, Lalit Mohan
 Datta, Kanak
 Datta, Niranjan
 Das, Manmatha Nath
 Das, Narendra Nath
 Das, Satya Prasad
 Das, Sunil
 Das Gupta, Asoke
 De, Kanailal
 Dugar, Rajsingha
 Goroi, Gour Mohan
Ghose, Aji
Ghose, Basanta
Ghose, Indra Narayan
 Ghose, Jagdish
 Ghose, Jahar
 Ghose, Sagarika
 Ghose, Sanmatha
 Guha, Madhusudan
 Guha, Samar

Gupta, Swadesh
 Mahapatra, Balaidas
 Majumdar, Haripada
 Majumdar, Jyotish
 Misra, Subodh Kumar
 Misra, Udaya Kanta
 Moitra, Jiban Ranjan
 Mukherjee, Aloke,
 Mukherjee, Manik
 Mukherjee, Purnendu
 Roy, Aji
 Roy, Hashi Kana
 Roy, Rajani
 Roy, Raj Kanta
 Roy, Sumitra
 Sen, Hemendra Kumar
 Sen, Deven
 Sen, Saila
 Sen, Santi
 Singh, Kali
 Singh, Rajaram
 Tah, Dasarathi
 Tewari, Dwarikanath

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS

AUDITORS REPORT -PRAJA SOCIALIST PARTY— CENTRAL OFFICE, BOMBAY

We have audited the annexed Balance Sheet of Praja Socialist Party—Central Office, Bombay, as at 31st December 1953 as set forth and the annexed Revenue Account for the year ended 31st December 1953 with the books and accounts maintained by the Praja Socialist Party—Central Office. We have obtained all the information and explanations we have required.

The Joint Secretary has assured that all the assets and liabilities have been correctly and fully brought in.

We are informed that the rent deposit of Rs. 350/- of the previous office at Dadar has become irrecoverable since the premises are occupied, by one of the ex-office bearers, at present and as such the same has been written off during the year under account.

Subject to the above, in our opinion the Balance Sheet and the Revenue Account are drawn up in conformity with the Law and the Balance Sheet exhibits a correct view of the state of affairs of the Praja Socialist Party—Central Office, according to best of our information and explanations afforded us and as shown by the books of the Praja Socialist Party—Central Office.

VARMA & Co.
*Chartered Accountants,
Honorary Auditors.*

Bombay, 10-12-1955.

PRAJA SOCIALIST PARTY

Revenue Account for the year

To Allowances	Rs. 14,815	0	0
„ Subventions	„ 23,831	9	6
„ Postage & Telegrams	„ 2,874	5	6
„ Travelling & Conveyance	„ 4,266	0	0
„ Printing & Stationery	„ 3,396	10	9
„ Meeting & Conferences	„ 6,962	2	9
„ Sundries	„ 1,320	10	3
„ Telephones	„ 878	0	0
„ Rent & Electricity	„ 5,135	5	0
„ Bank charges	„ 53	8	0
„ Depreciation	„ 892	8	9
„ Affiliation fees (A.S.C.)	„ 15,000	0	0
„ Bad Debts	„ 350	0	0
„ Surplus for the year	„ 9,589	10	0
Total	Rs. 89,365	6	6

LIABILITIES

BALANCE SHEET

<i>Capital Fund.</i>					
Being value of assets taken over from Socialist Party Central Office—as per last Balance Sheet			Rs. 10,322 9 0
<i>Loan—Shri Asoka Mehta</i>	...				„ 5,000 0 0
<i>Liabilities for outstanding expenses</i>	...				„ 229 6 0
<i>Surplus.</i>					
As per last Balance Sheet	...	Rs. 1,033 3 6			
Add: Surplus for the year as per Revenue Account	...	„ 9,589 10 0			„ 10,622 13 6
Total	...				Rs. 26,174 12 6

Examined and found correct subject to annexed report of date.

Bombay, 10-12-1955.

TRILOKI SINGH,
General Secretary

ended 31st December, 1953.

Total	...	Rs. 89,365	6	6
-------	-----	------------	---	---

ASSETS

<i>Furniture & Fixtures.</i>			
As per last Balance Sheet	...	Rs. 6,940	0 0
Less: Depreciation	...	" 690	0 0
			Rs. 6,250 0 0
<i>Cycle.</i>			
As per last Balance Sheet	...	" 105	0 0
Less: Depreciation	...	" 10	0 0
			" 95 0 0
<i>Office Equipment.</i>			
As per last Balance Sheet	...	" 475	0 0
Less: Depreciation	...	" 75	0 0
			" 400 0 0
<i>Library books.</i>			
As per last Balance Sheet	...	" 2,327	12 0
Additions during the year	...	" 34	12 9
		Rs. 2,362	8 9
Less: Depreciation	...	" 117	8 9
			" 2,245 0 0
<i>Deposit—Rent.</i>			
As per last Balance Sheet	...	Rs. 1,850	0 0
Less: Written Off	...	" 350	0 0
			" 1,500 0 0
<i>Suspense Account.</i>			
Staff and others	...		" 2,545 0 0
<i>Cash and Bank Balances.</i>			
Cash with Joint Secretary	...	Rs. 2,929	13 0
Cash with Bank of India Ltd.	...	" 10,209	15 6
			" 13,139 12 6
Total	...		Rs. 26,174 12 6

VARMA & Co.
*Chartered Accountants,
Honorary Auditors.*

AUDITORS REPORT—PRAJA SOCIALIST PARTY CENTRAL OFFICE, BOMBAY

We have audited the annexed Balance Sheet of Praja Socialist Party—Central Office, Bombay, as at 31st December 1954 as set forth and the annexed Revenue Account for the year ended 31st December 1954 with the books and accounts maintained by the Praja Socialist Party—Central Office. We have obtained all the information and explanations we have required.

The Joint Secretary has assured that all the assets and liabilities have been correctly and fully brought in.

We are informed that the accounts of Vindhya Pradesh have not been finalised and hence the amount received from them has been kept under suspense.

The cash and bank balances taken over from the literature Dept., have been accepted by us as correct.

We are informed that advances amounting to Rs. 2,245/- paid to different members has become irrecoverable and the same has been written off during the year under account.

Subject to the above, in our opinion, the Balance Sheet and the Revenue Account are drawn up in conformity with the Law and the Balance Sheet exhibits a correct view of the state of affairs of the Praja Socialist Party—Central Office, according to best of our information and explanations afforded us and as shown by the books of the Praja Socialist Party—Central Office.

Bombay, 10-12-1955.

VARMA & Co.
*Chartered Accountants,
Honorary Auditors.*

PRAJA SOCIALIST PARTY

Revenue Account for the year

To Allowance	Rs. 13,157	0	0
„ Rent	„ 4,842	15	6
„ Telephone	„ 617	6	3
„ Postage & Telegrams	„ 2,073	10	6
„ Printing & Stationery	„ 2,011	11	9
„ Travelling & Conveyance	„ 4,204	3	6
„ Sundries	„ 1,011	8	6
„ Bank charges	„ 13	4	6
„ Meeting & Conferences	„ 3,921	2	3
„ Subventions	„ 6,368	7	0
„ Loss on sale of Cycle	„ 45	0	0
„ Bad Debts	„ 2,245	0	0
„ Depreciation	„ 623	7	6
Total	Rs. 41,134	13	3

LIABILITIES

BALANCE SHEET

Capital Fund—

Being value of assets taken over
from Socialist Party Central
Office—as per last Balance Sheet

Rs. 10,322 9 0

Loan—Shri Asoka Mehta—As per
last Balance Sheet

„ 5,000 0 0

Suspense Account—

Literature Dept.
Vindhya Pradesh
William V. Albert

Rs. 884 3 1
„ 246 4 0
„ 60 1 0

„ 1,190 8 1

Total ...

Rs. 16,513 1 1

Examined and found correct subject to annexed report of date.

TRILOKI SINGH,
General Secretary.

Bombay, 10-12-1955.

CENTRAL OFFICE, BOMBAY.

ended 31st December, 1951.

By Donations	Rs. 18,191 7 0
„ Membership quotas	„ 4,470 4 0
„ Delegates Fees etc.	„ 1,452 0 0
„ Miscellaneous	„ 335 3 0
„ Bank Interest	„ 32 8 0
„ Deficit for the year	„ 16,653 7 3
 Total	 Rs. 41,134 13 3

AS AT 31-12-1954.		ASSETS	
<i>Furniture & Fixtures.</i>			
As per last Balance Sheet ...	Rs. 6,250 0 0		
Less: Sales during the year ...	" 50 0 0		
	Rs. 6,200 0 0		
Less: Depreciation ...	" 465 0 0	Rs. 5,735 0 0	
<i>Cycle.</i>			
As per last Balance Sheet ...	Rs. 95 0 0		
Less: Sale Proceeds ...	" 50 0 0		
	" 45 0 0		
Less: Loss transferred to Revenue ac	" 45 0 0		...
<i>Office Equipment.</i>			
As per last Balance Sheet ...	" 400 0 0		
Less: Depreciation ...	" 40 0 0	" 360 0 0	
<i>Library Books.</i>			
As per last Balance Sheet ...	Rs. 2,245 0 0		
Additions during the year ...	" 103 7 6		
	Rs. 2,348 7 6		
Less: Depreciation ...	" 118 7 6	" 2,230 0 0	
<i>Deposit—Rent.</i>			
As per last Balance Sheet ...		" 1,500 0 0	
<i>Cash and Bank Balances.</i>			
Cash with Joint Secretary ...	Rs. 576 1 0		
" " Bank of India Ltd. ...	" 33 1 3		
" " United Bank of India Ltd. ...	" 48 5 1	" 657 7 4	
<i>Deficit.</i>			
Deficit for the year as per Revenue Account ...	Rs. 16,653 7 3		
Less: Surplus as per last Balance Sheet ...	" 10,622 13 6	" 6,030 9 9	
Total ...		Rs. 16,513 1 1	

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी, पुस्तकालय
Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Library

मसूरी
MUSSOORIE.

यह पुस्तक निम्नांकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है ।

This book is to be returned on the date last stamped.

दिनांक Date	उधारकर्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.	दिनांक Date	उधारकर्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.

GL 324.254074
PRA 2ND CONF



104070

324.254074

Pr.

10 15 2

11111 1111

4 No 5121

1111 1111

1111 1111

Case No

1111 1111

1111

Author Pradya S Chaitin P. L. T.

जीवक (India)

324.254074

Par

LIBRARY

LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI

National Academy of Administration

MUSSOORIE

Accession No. ~~5715~~ 104972

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its